1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY 2 CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 3 ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., 4 Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-03993-HB vs. 5 BLACKBAUD, INC., et al., STATUS CONFERENCE 6 Defendants. 7 ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 8 et al., 1:24-cv-03998-HB Plaintiffs, 9 vs. 10 WHITEPAGES, INC., et al., Defendants. 11 12 Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse 13 4th and Cooper Streets Camden, New Jersey 08101 Monday, June 3, 2024 14 Commencing at 9:57 a.m. 1.5 16 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE HARVEY BARTLE, III, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE (EDPA) 17 18 19 (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES) 20 21 John J. Kurz, Federal Official Court Reporter John_Kurz@njd.uscourts.gov 22 (856)576-709423 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. 24 25

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
               Plaintiffs,
                                           1:24-cv-04000-HB
     vs.
 4
     HIYA, INC., et al.,
 5
               Defendants.
 6
                                      CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION,
 7
     et al.,
                                           1:24-cv-04037-HB
               Plaintiffs,
 8
     vs.
 9
     WE INFORM, LLC,
               Defendants.
10
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
               Plaintiffs,
12
                                          1:24-cv-04041-HB
     vs.
13
     INFOMATICS, LLC, et al.,
               Defendants.
14
15
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
16
     et al.,
                   Plaintiffs,
                                           1:24-cv-04045-HB
17
     vs.
18
     THE PEOPLE SEARCHERS, LLC, et al.,
                    Defendants.
19
20
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION,
                                          CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
21
                      Plaintiffs,
                                           1:24-cv-04073-HB
     vs.
22
     COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE EXCHANGE,
23
     INC., et al.,
                     Defendants.
24
25
                   (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
|--|----------------------|
| Plaintiffs, | 1:24-cv-04075-HB |
| vs. | |
| DM GROUP, INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| · | 1:24-cv-04077-HB |
| CARCO GROUP INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| Plaintiffs, vs. | 1:24-cv-04080-HB |
| DELUXE CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| • | 1:24-cv-04095-HB |
| TWILIO INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| • | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| et al., Plaintiffs, vs. | 1:24-cv-04096-HB |
| DELVEPOINT, LLC, et al., Defendants. | |
| | ONTO NEXT PAGES) |

| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
|--|----------------------|
| | 1:24-cv-04098-HB |
| vs. | |
| QUANTARIUM ALLIANCE, LLC, et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| Plaintiffs, vs. | 1:24-cv-04103-HB |
| YARDI SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| Plaintiffs, vs. | 1:24-cv-04104-HB |
| 6SENSE INSIGHTS, INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| <pre>et al., Plaintiffs,</pre> | 1:24-cv-04105-HB |
| vs. | |
| LIGHTBOX PARENT, L.P., et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| et al., <pre>Plaintiffs,</pre> | 1:24-cv-04106-HB |
| vs. | |
| SEARCH QUARRY, LLC, et al., Defendants. | |
| | |
| (CAPTION CONTINUI | ED ONTO NEXT PAGES) |

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
2
     et al.,
3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04107-HB
     vs.
 4
     ACXIOM, LLC, et al.,
                   Defendants.
5
 6
 7
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
8
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04110-HB
     vs.
9
     ENFORMION, LLC, et al.,
10
                   Defendants.
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
12
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04111-HB
13
     vs.
     COSTAR GROUP, INC., et al.,
14
                   Defendants.
1.5
16
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                                1:24-cv-04112-HB
17
                   Plaintiffs,
     vs.
18
     ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION,
19
     et al.,
                  Defendants.
20
21
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                              1:24-cv-04113-HB
22
                  Plaintiffs,
     vs.
23
     RED VIOLET, INC., et al.,
24
                   Defendants.
25
                     (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04114-HB
     vs.
 4
     RE/MAX, LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
 5
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                  {\it Plaintiffs},
                                        1:24-cv-04141-HB
 8
     vs.
 9
     DIGITAL SAFETY PRODUCTS, LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
10
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                              1:24-cv-04143-HB
12
                 Plaintiffs,
     vs.
13
     CIVIL DATA RESEARCH,
14
                   Defendants.
15
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
16
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04160-HB
17
     vs.
18
     SCALABLE COMMERCE, LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
19
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION,
20
                                        CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
21
                  Plaintiffs,
                                  1:24-cv-04168-HB
     vs.
22
     EPSILON DATA MANAGEMENT, LLC, et al.,
23
                   Defendants.
24
25
                     (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
|--|----------------------|
| et al., <i>Plaintiffs</i> , vs. | 1:24-cv-04171-HB |
| PEOPLE DATA LABS, INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| et al., <i>Plaintiffs,</i> vs. | 1:24-cv-04174-HB |
| LABELS & LISTS, INC., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| | 1:24-cv-04175-HB |
| CLARITAS, LLC, et al., Defendants. | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| • | 1:24-cv-04176-HB |
| INNOVIS DATA SOLUTIONS INC., et al., Defendants. | r |
| • | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| et al., <i>Plaintiffs,</i> vs. | 1:24-cv-04178-HB |
| ACCURATE APPEND, INC., et al., Defendants. | |
| Detendants. | |

| et al., Plaintiffs, vs. REMINE INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. LUSHA SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-04184-HB 1:24-cv-04184-HB 1:24-cv-04184-HB 1:24-cv-04184-HB | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04182-HB VS. REMINE INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04184-HB VS. LUSHA SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04217-HB VS. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-04227-HB VS. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | et al., | · | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, vs. REMINE INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. LUSHA SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. Plaintiffs, vs. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | DATA AXLE, INC | | |
| Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04184-HB VS. LUSHA SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04217-HB VS. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-04227-HB VS. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | et al., | · | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| et al., Plaintiffs, vs. LUSHA SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-04217-HB CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-04227-HB vs. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | REMINE INC., et | • | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04217-HB vs. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04227-HB vs. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | et al., | · | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, vs. TELTECH SYSTEMS, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | LUSHA SYSTEMS, | | |
| Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, civil action number: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04227-HB vs. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | et al., | | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04227-HB vs. PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al., Defendants. | TELTECH SYSTEMS | | |
| Defendants. | et al., | | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES) | PEOPLECONNECT, | • | _ |
| | | (CAPTION CONTIN | UED ONTO NEXT PAGES) |

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04230-HB
     vs.
 4
     CORELOGIC, INC., et al.,
 5
                  Defendants.
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04233-HB
 8
     vs.
 9
     BLACK KNIGHT TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
     et al.,
10
                  Defendants.
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
12
     et al.,
                 {\it Plaintiffs},
                                        1:24-cv-04256-HB
13
     vs.
     ZILLOW, INC., et al.,
14
                  Defendants.
1.5
16
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
17
                Plaintiffs,
                                 1:24-cv-04261-HB
     vs.
18
     EQUIMINE, INC., et al.,
                   Defendants.
19
20
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
21
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04269-HB
22
     vs.
23
     THOMSON REUTERS CORPORATION, et al.,
                  Defendants.
24
25
                     (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                          1:24-cv-04271-HB
     vs.
 4
     CHOREOGRAPH LLC, et al.,
 5
                   Defendants.
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04288-HB
 8
     vs.
     TRANSUNION, LLC, et al.,
 9
                   Defendants.
10
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                                  1:24-cv-04292-HB
12
                  Plaintiffs,
     vs.
13
     MELISSA DATA CORP., et al.,
                   Defendants.
14
15
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
16
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                          1:24-cv-04298-HB
17
     vs.
18
     EQUIFAX INC., et al.,
                   Defendants.
19
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION,
20
                                         CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
21
                  Plaintiffs,
                                          1:24-cv-04299-HB
     vs.
22
     SPOKEO, INC., et al.,
23
                   Defendants.
24
25
                    (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04324-HB
     vs.
 4
     RESTORATION OF AMERICA, et al.,
 5
                  Defendants.
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04345-HB
 8
     vs.
 9
     i360, LLC, et al.,
                   Defendants.
10
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                              1:24-cv-04354-HB
12
                Plaintiffs,
     vs.
13
     TELNYX LLC, et al.,
14
                   Defendants.
1.5
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
16
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04380-HB
17
     vs.
18
     GOHUNT, LLC, et al.,
                   Defendants.
19
20
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
21
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04383-HB
     vs.
22
     ACCUZIP, INC., et al.,
23
                   Defendants.
24
25
                   (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04385-HB
     vs.
 4
     SYNAPTIX TECHNOLOGY, LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
 5
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04389-HB
 8
     vs.
 9
     JOY ROCKWELL ENTERPRISES, INC.,
     et al.,
10
                  Defendants.
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
12
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04390-HB
13
     vs.
14
     FORTNOFF FINANCIAL, LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
15
16
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
17
                  Plaintiffs,
                                 1:24-cv-04392-HB
     vs.
18
     MYHERITAGE, LTD., et al.,
                   Defendants.
19
20
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
21
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04434-HB
22
     vs.
23
    E-MERGES.COM, INC.,
                  Defendants.
24
25
                     (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04442-HB
     vs.
 4
     WILAND, INC., et al.,
 5
                  Defendants.
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                 Plaintiffs,
                                        1:24-cv-04447-HB
 8
     vs.
 9
     ATDATA, LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
10
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                                1:24-cv-04566-HB
12
                   Plaintiffs,
     vs.
13
     LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT,
14
     LLC, et al.,
                  Defendants.
15
16
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                               1:24-cv-04571-HB
17
                  Plaintiffs,
     vs.
18
     PRECISELY HOLDINGS, LLC, et al.,
                   Defendants.
19
20
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
21
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04609-HB
22
     vs.
23
    NUWBER, INC., et al.,
                  Defendants.
24
25
                     (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

```
1
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 2
     et al.,
 3
                  Plaintiffs,
                                         1:24-cv-04664-HB
     vs.
 4
     ROCKETREACH LLC, et al.,
 5
                   Defendants.
 6
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
 7
     et al.,
                                         1:24-cv-04696-HB
                  Plaintiffs,
 8
     vs.
 9
     OUTSIDE INTERACTIVE, INC.,
                   Defendants.
10
11
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
     et al.,
                  Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-04770-HB
12
     vs.
13
     VALASSIS DIGITAL CORP., et al.,
                   Defendants.
14
15
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
16
     et al.,
                  {\it Plaintiffs},
                                        1:24-cv-04850-HB
17
     vs.
18
     THE LIFETIME VALUE CO. LLC, et al.,
                   Defendants.
19
     ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION,
                                        CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
20
     et al.,
21
                  Plaintiffs,
                                       1:24-cv-04949-HB
     vs.
22
     BELLES CAMP COMMUNICATIONS, INC., et al.,
23
                   Defendants.
24
25
                     (CAPTION CONTINUED ONTO NEXT PAGES)
```

| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05334-HB VS. FIRST AMERICAN FINANCIAL CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05600-HB VS. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB VS. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05658-HB VS. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05658-HB ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05775-HB ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05775-HB ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05775-HB | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| et al., VS. FIRST AMERICAN FINANCIAL CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. PROPERTYRADAR, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. AMERILIST, INC., et al., AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | |
| Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05334-HB VS. FIRST AMERICAN FINANCIAL CORPORATION, et al., | | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| FIRST AMERICAN FINANCIAL CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05600-HB VS. PROPERTYRADAR, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB VS. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB VS. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB VS. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB VS. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | 1.24 05224 UD |
| FIRST AMERICAN FINANCIAL CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | • | 1:24-CV-05554-HB |
| CORPORATION, et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. PROPERTYRADAR, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, T:24-cv-05658-HB Vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, T:24-cv-05775-HB Vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, VS. PROPERTYRADAR, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, VS. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | CORPORATION, et al., | |
| Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05600-HB vs. PROPERTYRADAR, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB vs. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | · | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| PROPERTYRADAR, INC., et al., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, Vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | Plaintiffs, | 1:24-cv-05600-HB |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB vs. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB vs. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. | | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB vs. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. | | |
| Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05656-HB VS. THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB VS. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB VS. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| THE ALESCO GROUP, L.L.C., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | 1 · 24_av_05656_UP |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | • | 1:24-CV-03636-HB |
| et al., Plaintiffs, SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., 1:24-cv-05775-HB VS. | | |
| Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05658-HB vs. SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | · | 1.24 05659 IID |
| SEARCHBUG, INC., Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | • | 1:24-CV-05656-HB |
| Defendants. ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | |
| ATLAS DATA PRIVACY CORPORATION, CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | · | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | Defendants. | |
| et al., Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | | |
| Plaintiffs, 1:24-cv-05775-HB vs. AMERILIST, INC., et al., | · | CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: |
| AMERILIST, INC., et al., | · | 1 · 24_arr_0E77E_UD |
| AMERILIST, INC., et al., | • | 1:24-CV-U3//3-HB |
| | | |
| | | |
| | <u> </u> | |
| | | |
| | | |

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
            BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
            BY: ADAM R. SHAW, ESQUIRE
 3
            30 South Pearl Street, 12th Floor
            Albany, New York 12207
            For the Plaintiffs
 4
 5
            BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
            BY: HSIAO (MARK) C. MAO, ESQUIRE
 6
            44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
            San Francisco, California 94104
 7
            For the Plaintiffs
 8
            MORGAN & MORGAN
            BY: RYAN JOSEPH McGEE, ESQUIRE
 9
            201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
            Tampa, Florida 33602
10
            For the Plaintiffs
11
            PEM LAW LLP
            BY: RAJIV D. PARIKH, ESQUIRE
12
            1 Boland Drive, Suite 101
            West Orange, New Jersey 07052
13
            For the Plaintiffs
14
            TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
15
                 ANGELO A. STIO III, ESQUIRE
                 MELISSA CHUDEREWICZ, ESQUIRE
16
            301 Carnegie Center, Suite 400
            Princeton, New Jersey 08543
17
            For the Defendants CARCO Group Inc.; Acxiom, LLC;
            AtData, LLC; Deluxe Corporation; DM Group, Inc.;
18
            Enformion, LLC; Red Violet, Inc.; Remine Inc.;
            RocketReach LLC; CoreLogic, Inc.
19
20
            VEDDER PRICE, P.C.
            BY:
                 BLAINE C. KIMREY, ESQUIRE
21
            222 North LaSalle Street
            Chicago, Illinois 60601
22
            For the Defendants Whitepages, Inc., and Hiya, Inc.,
            et al.
23
24
                     (Appearances continued onto next page.)
25
```

```
1
     A P P E A R A N C E S: (Continued)
 2
            SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
            By: ROBERT T. SZYBA, Esquire
 3
            620 Eighth Avenue, 32nd Floor
            New York, New York 10018
            For the Defendants Infomatics, LLC; The People
 4
            Searchers, LLC; and We Inform, LLC, et al.
 5
            McCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
 6
            BY: SCOTT S. CHRISTIE, ESQUIRE
            Four Gateway Center
 7
            100 Mulberry Street
            Newark, New Jersey 07102
 8
            For the Defendants Black Knight Technologies, LLC and
            Black Knight, Inc.
 9
            HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
10
            BY: DAVID M. CHEIFETZ, ESQUIRE
            390 Madison Avenue
11
            New York, New York 10017
            For the Defendant The Lifetime Value Co.
12
            LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP
13
            BY: ROBERT C. COLLINS, III, ESQUIRE
            330 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 2800
14
            Chicago, Illinois 60611
            For the Defendants CoStar Group, Inc.; CoStar Realty
15
            Information, Inc.; Lightbox Parent, L.P.; Lightbox
            Holdings, L.P.; Oracle International Corporation; Oracle
16
            America, Inc.; Oracle Corp.; PeopleConnect Holdings,
            Inc.; Intelius, LLC; and PeopleConnect Intermediate, LLC
17
18
            FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
                ROSS LEWIN, ESQUIRE
            105 College Road East, Suite 300
19
            Princeton, New Jersey 08542
20
            For the Defendants Epsilon Data Management, LLC;
            Conversant LLC; and Citrus Ad International, Inc.
21
22
            SAUL EWING LLP
            BY: WILLIAM C. BATON, ESQUIRE
23
            1 Riverfront Plaza, 1037 Raymond Boulevard
            Apartment 1520
            Newark, New Jersey 07102
24
            For the Defendants Precisely and Valassis
25
                     (Appearances continued onto next page.)
```

| 7 | A D D T A D A W C T C. (Continued) |
|------------|---|
| 1 | APPEARANCES: (Continued) |
| 2 | PARKER POE ADAMS & BERNSTEIN, LLP BY: SARAH FULTON HUTCHINS, ESQUIRE |
| <i>3 4</i> | 620 South Tryon Street, Suite 800 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202 For the Defendant BlackBaud, Inc. |
| | |
| 5 | Also Present: |
| 6 | Larry MacStravic, The Courtroom Deputy |
| 7 | Maria Cosma, Judicial Law Clerk |
| 8 | (Further appearances of counsel are listed on sign-in sheet, Attachment 1, to the docket minute entry.) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| | |
| 25 | |

```
1
                (PROCEEDINGS held in open court before The Honorable
 2
     Harvey Bartle, III, United States District Judge, at
 3
     9:57 a.m. as follows:)
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Good morning. You may be seated.
 6
               MR. SHAW: Good morning, Your Honor.
 7
               MR. PARIKH: Good morning.
 8
               MR. STIO: Good morning, Your Honor.
 9
               MS. CHUDEREWICZ: Good morning.
10
               THE COURT: Thank you for coming. The topic of this
11
     morning's conference centers on the scope of discovery with
12
     respect to the remand motions and also a briefing schedule.
13
     But before we get to that, there's some issue that's been
14
     raised about the form of discovery.
1.5
               Mr. Stio has disputed that. And I quess the question
16
     is whether we should try to go through the various requests,
17
     get it decided here today, and put it in an order, rather than
18
     wait for Rule 34 motions to be filed and then objections and
     all the rest of it. Because I think the issues are pretty well
19
20
     teed up here at this point.
21
               Mr. Stio, I'll hear from you on that.
22
               MR. STIO: Good morning, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Good morning.
24
               MR. STIO: My view on that is that there's a process
25
     under the federal rules so that we can have certainty as to
```

what documents are being requested, whether there are documents that are being withheld, whether there are documents that they don't have, and if they're claiming privilege over documents, we would like to see what they're claiming privilege over.

I think with the order, it provides a vagueness where a party could take advantage of that. And my preference would be to follow the federal rules. There's a process in place. I know that other courts have employed that even with subject matter jurisdiction, and I would respectfully request that we use that here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Shaw.

MR. SHAW: Good morning, Your Honor. Adam Shaw for the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good morning. Yeah.

MR. SHAW: We think that that's just an overburden in this situation here. We tried to follow Your Honor's direction at the last conference that we not slice this too thin. We are trying to give them everything about the assignment that they could gain the information that they need for this jurisdiction.

I think it's important to remember the context. The context is they have the burden of proving that we colluded for the purpose of somehow getting these, you know, subset of undefined group of the remand defendants into state court, even though there's double that amount that are in federal court.

I mean, the initial assumption is a fiction. We asked them, what is it that you want? What's the basis of it? And they said, we don't have a factual basis for determining collusion. We have speculation. And so we're trying to put a reasonable, efficient way of getting them the information that they need.

They want information about the assignments, here's our list, we're giving you the assignments, we're giving you — you could determine the amount of the assignment, the timing of the assignment, the relationship between the parties in the assignment. We're giving them that. They raised an issue about the PBA. We're going to give them the PBA documents. Most importantly, we're going to give them a 30(b)(6) witness. Half of these questions that they have about motive, they could just get it from the 30(b)(6) witness. Instead they want us to engage in this wholesome process that we think goes too far, because then we're going to start arguing about, you know, what are the sources, what are the search terms, what are all of the things that are just unnecessary here, especially when you have a 30(b)(6) witness.

THE COURT: Mr. Stio.

MR. STIO: I think we got a little bit off of the subject of what is the form, but, Your Honor, I want to try to prevent gamesmanship here. I want to serve document requests. I want to serve a Rule 30(b)(6) notice. They are not

burdensome. They are very narrow. They focus on the *Grassi* factors that the plaintiffs admit are relevant. And one of the things that they fail to recognize to Your Honor but they have in their document, the letter that they submitted, is all the cases that we have put in our letter talk about the totality of the circumstances. And the scope is not narrow collusion. The scope is, who is the real party in interest?

And our document requests, our topics are targeted to that. And they're targeted to issues of what communications occurred here. And we're not looking for broad ESI. But we have put before Your Honor a factual basis for why we think that there is collusion and why Atlas isn't a real party in interest.

In April of 2023, Atlas started soliciting all of these police officers. They have come to this Court on two prior occasions saying, we have to get these nondisclosure requests in place, we need people to start taking things down. They held on to these documents since April of 2023, these assignments, some of them.

We need to know what representations, what communications were occurring with the PBA.

Now, they said, well, we're going to give the PBA documents. No. If you look at what they proposed, they're going to give us a contract. They're not going to give us any communications with Pat Colligan of why he's writing a letter

on April 5th saying, "Atlas Privacy, the time is now, sign up."

They jerry-rigged this to create a lawsuit --

THE COURT: I think we're getting off the subject. I really want to talk about the format.

MR. STIO: Okay.

THE COURT: And there are two ways to go here. One is the more traditional way, you file your motion or your request for production and so forth, and then the plaintiff objects if it believes that you're asking for things that you're not entitled to. And that's going to delay it.

Now, in this case, unlike many cases, you've already set forth what you want in your letter to me and to counsel, and they have set forth what they're prepared to give. So it seems to me it would expedite the matter if the Court entered an order, after discussion here today, what the plaintiff will be required to produce.

Your record is protected because this hearing is on the record, and like any other hearing, you have made a record as to what you wanted and what the Court may not permit you to have and any other discovery dispute. So it seems to me we're in a position to go through the list today. We know what the plaintiff is willing to produce, and then you can make your pitch about what should be added and then I enter an order, require the plaintiffs to produce the documents within a certain period of time, and we'll deal with that subject with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

faith of the parties.

```
respect to the Rule 30(b)(6) depositions, what the topics are,
and we'll get that straightened out, and then you'll have your
30(b)(6) deposition after you receive the documents, and then
we'll have briefing. I mean, it seems to me pretty
straightforward, particularly the way it's been set up so far
with your disclosing exactly what you want.
          So in effect, you have prepared your Rule 34 request.
          MR. STIO: I understand that, Your Honor.
          Can I ask a question?
          THE COURT: Sure.
          MR. STIO: Would any order include the obligation to
identify what documents are being withheld, what documents
don't exist, and a privilege log if they're withholding
documents on privilege?
          THE COURT: Well, according to their letter, there
are certain things that they said they would be willing to
produce, but they say they have no documents. That's true in
any discovery. You file your request under Rule 34, and the
other side responds, "we don't have any documents," correct?
So if I order them to produce documents and then they say they
don't have the documents, unless you find out later they do,
that's the end of the story, isn't it?
          MR. STIO:
                     I --
```

THE COURT: I mean, discovery depends on the good

Ιf

1 MR. STIO: Correct, Your Honor. But what I would 2 like --3 THE COURT: I'm not about to go make an inspection of all of their records, nor is anyone else. 4 5 MR. STIO: No; I hear Your Honor. But what I'm 6 asking for is, when they produce documents, if they are not 7 going to produce a category, I would like to have it in 8 writing. Or if they are withholding documents on the basis of 9 privilege, before I go down a path of having to take a 10 deposition, I just want to know, if documents exist, if they 11 are claiming that they're going to withhold anything on 12 privilege. 13 THE COURT: Well, they're always entitled to withhold privileged documents, but you just want the identification of 14 15 any relevant document that you think -- that they think is 16 privileged; is that right? 17 MR. STIO: And I'm fine with them exercising their 18 right for privilege, but I think I should be able to see a 19 privilege log of what they're claiming privilege over. 20 THE COURT: Well, let me ask Mr. Shaw. I quess -- go 21 ahead. 22 MR. SHAW: You know, he said he didn't want to get 23 involved in gamesmanship and Your Honor said, you know, there's

he asks a question at the 30(b)(6) deposition and it gets into

got to be good faith. We're coming to this in good faith.

24

25

```
1
     a time period when Atlas was talking to attorneys, then a
 2
     privilege assertion will be made.
 3
               THE COURT: Absolutely.
 4
               MR. SHAW: I don't -- from our list, because our list
 5
     is set up so that it's not excluding privileged documents
 6
     necessarily, so --
 7
               THE COURT: It is excluding or is not?
 8
               MR. SHAW: I mean, I guess -- I don't think -- we
 9
     didn't set it up that way. We set it up with the documents
10
     we're willing to give them. We're not aware of any
11
     documents -- I mean, obviously after litigation started and we
12
     got into these kinds of things there's now privileged
13
     documents. But at the time of these assignments, I don't think
14
     there was.
15
               THE COURT: Right.
                          So I think he should just ask the 30(b)(6)
16
17
     witness; and if he says there's privileged stuff, then we can
18
     raise it at that point and then give them an identification of
19
     those.
20
               THE COURT: Is there anyone else who wants to say
21
     anything on this issue? Let me hear from anybody else on the
22
     form of discovery, whether the Court ought to enter an order
23
     requiring plaintiff to produce certain documents, or should we
24
     go the route of waiting until the defendants serve the Rule 34
```

request?

```
1
               Anybody have anything to add on that subject?
 2
               All right. Yes, sir.
 3
               MR. KIMREY: Your Honor, Blaine Kimrey for Whitepages
 4
     and Hiya.
 5
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
 6
               MR. KIMREY: We're actually fine with formal requests
 7
     or an order by the Court because the effect will be the same.
 8
     And you're right, Your Honor. We think that maybe an order
 9
     would be more efficient.
10
               THE COURT: Right.
11
               MR. KIMREY: But we agree with Mr. Stio that the rule
12
     should be followed with respect to what's being produced,
13
     what's being held back, what doesn't exist and that a privilege
14
     log be provided. Because I am concerned that plaintiffs'
1.5
     counsel, in drafting their list, has drafted it in a way to
16
     circumvent privileged documents and we need to know if there
17
     are documents withheld based on privilege.
18
               THE COURT: Right.
               MR. KIMREY: So that's our position, Your Honor.
19
20
               THE COURT: All right.
                                       Thank you.
21
               MR. KIMREY: And also to clarify something in the
22
     letter that they sent last night, they suggested that the
23
     defendants that didn't opt into the Troutman letter didn't
24
     agree with it.
25
               That's not the case. My understanding -- we
```

```
1
     supported the Troutman letter.
               THE COURT:
 2
                           Right.
 3
               MR. KIMREY: And actually participated in one of the
 4
     meet-and-confers, which is noted in the footnote in the letter
 5
     of the opposition.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Right.
 7
                            I hesitate to do this again because it
               MR. KIMREY:
 8
     kind of came back to haunt me when I did it last time, but I
 9
     don't think any one of the defense lawyers here opposes the
10
     positions fundamentally that Mr. Stio is taking.
11
               THE COURT: All right.
12
               MR. KIMREY: I think that we support him.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Well, that deals with the
14
     scope of discovery.
15
               All right. I think what I'm going to do is I'm going
16
     to ultimately enter an order which will identify the documents
17
     to be produced by the plaintiff, and we'll set a deadline and
18
     then time for the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition and then the
19
     briefing schedule.
20
               But I think what we need to do now is take
21
     Mr. Parikh's letter and, Mr. Stio, you can start with that, and
22
     you can make your argument as to what additional materials are
23
     to be produced, all right, so I can then have a --
24
               MR. PARIKH: Your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Yeah.
```

MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, Raj Parikh on behalf of the plaintiffs. Just one thing on the privilege log before we start going through the categories.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. PARIKH: So I think we're fine with advising them, you know, if there's a category of documents, we've talked about what it is. So if we say, for example, the service terms, and we're talking about providing multiple iterations of the service terms --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PARIKH: -- we have no issue saying to them we've withheld documents on the basis of privilege. I think with some of their categories, if there is a desire from the defense that we produce a full-blown privilege log, then we're talking about a significant amount of information, perhaps. I'm not sure, but, you know, if we start getting into emails and things like that.

And just by way of simple example, Your Honor, you know, most of these cases were filed starting in early February. So from some point in late January or mid-January through early February, there's obviously a lot of activity to get, you know, 140-plus cases ready for filing.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PARIKH: To have to create a privilege log within that time period would be significant in terms of the

proportionality analysis and for plaintiffs to have to go through that, so if we put some time parameters on it. If they're interested in, you know, prior to the notices being served, for example, in December and putting that on as a privilege log, I think we can work through those issues. But I just want to frame that as, you know, one particular issue in terms of proportionality.

THE COURT: Well, what would be done in the normal Rule 34 request for production?

MR. PARIKH: So it would be that there would be a full-blown privilege log, Your Honor. But it would -- if we're limiting it just to subject matter jurisdiction, then we would be talking about search terms, you know, which custodians, documents would have to be searched for, et cetera, and that will add significant time, I think, to this process.

And so I think what we've proposed, because we've gone through a good faith analysis with our client, we don't believe that the communications that Mr. Stio is talking about exist, but we don't want to end up in a gotcha game where, you know, there might be one errant email or something along those lines seven months down the road that somebody construes to be related to this issue when it really is not.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll get to that.

MR. PARIKH: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't we -- I assume, Mr. Stio, you

```
1
     have no objection to the production of the documents identified
     in Mr. Parikh's June 2nd letter. Start with that.
 2
 3
     items 1 through 7.
 4
               MR. STIO: I do have an objection.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Now, let's talk about what
 6
     you want in addition to that.
 7
               MR. STIO: Well, no, I have an objection as to those
 8
             And the objection is, Your Honor --
     items.
 9
               THE COURT: You object to the production?
10
               MR. STIO: On what they have in their letter, yeah.
11
               If Your Honor would go to page 2 of their letter --
12
               THE COURT: Yeah.
13
               MR. STIO: -- they have used a defined term as
14
     "relevant time period," or "relevant period."
15
               During the last --
16
               THE COURT: Well, what --
17
               MR. STIO: On Item No. 1, it's at -- three-quarters
18
     down there.
               THE COURT: Oh, I see. You're right.
19
20
               MR. STIO: Yeah.
21
               So during the last conference, Your Honor, they
22
     represented that they were going to produce at least three
23
     versions of the service terms. And the versions date back to
24
     January of 2023.
25
               THE COURT: Right.
```

```
1
               MR. STIO: This definition, which carries over not
 2
     only in number 1, but also in number 3 --
 3
               THE COURT: Right.
               MR. STIO: -- seems to narrow that to the time that
 4
 5
     they sent out their first nondisclosure request on Christmas
 6
     Eve or New Year's Eve, not dating back to January 2023, not at
 7
     the time of April 5, 2023 when they were out at conventions for
 8
     the PBA soliciting members to sign up. And I think that
 9
     they've really constrained it and they've walked back from what
10
     they represented to this Court.
11
               THE COURT: So what would you suggest is the time
12
     period?
13
               MR. STIO: I think the relevant time period is
14
     January 1, 2023 to the present.
1.5
               THE COURT: All right. Let's just deal with that.
16
               Mr. Shaw, what about that?
17
               MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, I can handle that.
18
               THE COURT: Mr. Parikh, go ahead.
19
               MR. PARIKH: Yes.
20
               So we have no problem with January 1, 2023, Judge.
21
                   We've said that. We said we would provide the
     That's fine.
22
     service terms. I think coming up to the present date is a
23
     little bit of an issue for the reasons that I said, to the
24
     extent that they want privilege logs. If it's just about the
25
     service terms, that's fine, we can give them the service terms
```

1 in place for this --2 THE COURT: Yeah. What would be the relevance of any 3 service terms that have been developed since the last case was 4 filed? 5 When was the last case filed? 6 MR. PARIKH: Late February, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So if they recently developed a 8 service term in May, what relevance is that to our cases here? 9 MR. STIO: My belief, Your Honor, I don't have the document in front of me, when I looked at it, service terms 10 11 have a provision that say they can be amended by Atlas at any 12 time, similar to what their terms of use in their privacy 13 policies say. 14 So if there is a superseding document where someone 15 has a membership and has a service and the service term is 16 amended by something that occurs after February 4, 2024, which 17 is the latest one that was on their website, we would want to 18 look at that. 19 THE COURT: Right. MR. PARIKH: So two points, Judge. One, I'm not sure 20 21 what that has to do with subject matter jurisdiction, right? 22 They've -- the cases before that --23 THE COURT: Right. Because the case was filed --24 it's what happened as of the time the complaint was filed. And

so what happened afterwards has nothing to do with collusion,

25

```
1
     does it?
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, if they filed the case and the
 2
 3
     percentage of sharing of the recovery has changed, I think it
 4
     goes back to whether or not this was a legitimate assignment.
 5
               THE COURT: I see.
 6
               MR. PARIKH: And to short-circuit, Your Honor, I
 7
     don't believe the service terms have been amended since before
 8
     the first case was filed.
 9
               THE COURT: Well, then, why are we -- let's not fuss
     about it. It's a moot point. We'll just say January 1, 2023
10
11
     up to the present.
12
               MR. PARIKH: And what we said, Your Honor, because we
13
     don't want to use that time period for every category, we said
14
     until the last case was filed, because that would be relevant
15
     to a subject matter-jurisdiction analysis. And that's what we
     put in our definition -- "to the date of the last filed
16
17
     complaint."
18
               THE COURT: What about that, Mr. Stio?
19
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I'm fine with "the last filed
20
     complaint."
21
               THE COURT: All right. "Last filed complaint."
22
     right.
23
               January 1, 2023, last filed complaint, as to
24
     number 1. All right.
25
               How about number 2?
```

```
1
               MR. STIO: So, if we're dealing with relevant period
     and that's the same for number 2a --
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Make it the same relevant period,
     January 1, 2023 through February 4, 2024.
 4
 5
               MR. STIO: That's fine.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. Number 3. Again, amending
 7
     the relevant time period.
 8
               MR. STIO: As long as we get all versions with the
 9
     amended time period, that's fine.
10
               THE COURT: Okay.
11
               MR. PARIKH:
                            Judge, on this one, I believe that some
12
     of the defendants -- and I'm happy to continue forward if you'd
13
     like to, but I know that some defendants -- and I believe
14
     Mr. Christie is standing there to raise this very issue, I
15
     presume -- but have requested copies of every single assignment
16
     confirmation.
17
               What we have proposed is to provide templates and
18
     then a chart, essentially, that lists out what those issues
19
     are. So I wanted to raise that if this is the appropriate
20
     moment to do so.
21
               THE COURT: Mr. Stio, and then we'll hear from
22
     Mr. Christie.
23
               MR. STIO: One of the issues that we have, Your
24
     Honor, on that is they have produced the spreadsheets that Your
25
     Honor ordered them to produce of the assignors.
```

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STIO: And the spreadsheets have far, far more names identified than what we believe were sent out. They have far, far more names identified than actually what is alleged in each of the complaints. And in my client's instances, we've received spreadsheets of, you know, 35,000 names, 40,000 names. And you look at the complaint, and the number of covered persons or assignors are 19,000.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STIO: And we just want to know, well, what's going on and who are the assignors? I think we're entitled to know the identity.

THE COURT: Mr. Parikh.

MR. PARIKH: So, with all due respect to Mr. Stio, that's factually inaccurate. The lists may have 40,000 entries, but it still is the 16-, 17-, 18,000, 19,000 names for each particular defendant. And the reason why the list is set up that way is because you have an individual, a police officer, that may have made a request to Mr. Stio's client to remove their home address and a phone number and a second phone number, which would be three requests for that one person.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. PARIKH: So when you talk about 35- to 40,000, that's the reason.

The other thing, Your Honor, is the list is unique

for each and every single defendant entity. And so as I mentioned during our prior conferences, different people on board at a different time since the Atlas system and they sent to a different entity.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PARIKH: So the list we provided in order to have these defendants comply with Daniel's Law, which some of them still haven't done that as we stand here today, was as a courtesy so that they could do that.

We have represented to them these are the individuals that have transmitted requests to your entity.

Some of the defendants, Judge, and obviously with even just the 30-plus defendants here that are remand defendants, some of them put blocks in place. So they stopped receiving emails because they didn't want them. Others it went to spam. So there's all kinds of little issues. None of that has to do with subject matter jurisdiction, which is what we're here for.

So we got a request that they want the dates of the assignments. We said, we don't really think it's necessary for subject matter jurisdiction, but fine, we'll give it to you, we'll put it in a chart. You'll have the name of the person. You'll have the date of their assignment, the information that they requested to be redacted, and then we also went the extra step to say that we'll also provide to you a categorization of

```
1
     who that person is, whether they're law enforcement, a
 2
     prosecutor, a judicial officer, or a family member.
 3
               THE COURT: All right.
               MR. STIO: Do you want to hear from Mr. Christie?
 4
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Yes.
 6
               MR. CHRISTIE:
                              Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: You're welcome.
 8
               State your name for the record, please.
 9
               MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, Your Honor. Scott Christie on
     behalf of Black Knight Technologies.
10
11
               THE COURT: Yes.
12
               MR. CHRISTIE: A couple quick things, Judge.
13
               We have received, as Mr. Stio mentioned, the covered
14
     persons list. We have crunched them based on what we can do by
1.5
     virtue of comparison to the emails that we received, and there
16
     are thousands, Judge, thousands of names that we do not
17
     recognize from the emails.
18
               I've conversed with Mr. Parikh about this.
19
     based on their concern that we actually reduce and redact the
20
     data of the covered persons that made the requests, have asked
21
     for the emails. He tells me he will not produce them because
22
     he thinks it is, by virtue of the request, goes to merits
23
     discovery and that it's not appropriate for us to get that
     information now.
24
25
               His position is that based on the covered persons
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
list, if you don't take down all the data for those people, you
do so at your peril. In essence, what they are doing, Judge,
is trying to add additional take-down requests by virtue of
these covered persons lists based upon emails that haven't been
sent by the covered persons, which is required.
          THE COURT: But what does this have to do with
subject matter jurisdiction?
          MR. CHRISTIE: It does not have to do with subject
matter --
          THE COURT: Well, let's deal with subject matter
jurisdiction. And if there are any other issues, we'll deal
with them later this morning if they're pressing, all right?
          MR. CHRISTIE: All right. May I just quickly address
the scope of the discovery?
          Our position, Judge, is that Your Honor mentioned
that the scope should be limited to the date of the last filed
complaint.
          Our perception is that Atlas, you know, should not
have a hard-and-fast end period of that point for two reasons.
          Number one, to the extent that they are planning, as
we have heard, to make, you know, additional bombardment with
additional email requests.
          And number two, to the extent that any of the
complaints are amended in any way.
```

So our perception --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: Well, if they amend them, then we'll deal
with that at that point. But we have to just deal with the
facts as they exist today, so.
          All right.
                      Thank you.
          MR. CHRISTIE: I understand, Judge.
          MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, just one point with respect
to what counsel just raised. And I know we're not going to get
into details. But in one of our letters, you'll notice that we
talked about we would argue waiver of personal jurisdiction.
We are unequivocally clear as to what Your Honor's directive
was, but it's these types of requests from the defendants where
we said if the defendants are going to go beyond the, kind of,
narrow corridor that Your Honor set up for subject matter
jurisdiction, then it would be a waiver of personal
jurisdiction arguments, and we would maintain that to the
extent it goes beyond that corridor.
          THE COURT: I think I made it pretty clear that we're
not -- there's no waiver of anything else here.
          MR. PARIKH: I understand.
          THE COURT: Let's just focus on the facial challenge
and also on the remand.
          MR. PARIKH: Correct, Judge. Thank you.
          THE COURT: All right.
          Let's move on now to number 4.
          MR. STIO:
                    Yes.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, we would need that to be expanded to include communications. And the communications relate back to this April 5, 2023 letter, what they were communicating to the PBA about the litigations, about the relationship, about the real party in interest. THE COURT: It says, "Contracts between Atlas and law enforcement unions based in New Jersey." Okay. MR. STIO: Correct. THE COURT: And that would be the same period, right? January 1, 2023 through February 4, 2024? MR. STIO: Well, they have it unlimited, Your Honor. I don't know when they went into a contract with --THE COURT: Well, what time period -- this is unlimited, number 4? MR. PARIKH: Yeah. I think we would -- I think it's -- I think we're fine doing it up until today, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. MR. PARIKH: You know, at the end of the day, I think the distinction Mr. Stio is trying to draw is communications versus contracts. You know, again, I think I would go back to when we get into communications, the most efficient pathway here is for them to ask the 30(b)(6) witness questions. If the 30(b)(6) witness says oh, yeah, you know what, I had, you know, all of these email exchanges, which I don't

think he'll testify and say that because I don't think they

1 exist, but if he testifies to that, then we can revisit that issue if we need to. 2 3 THE COURT: Well, I don't know. It seems to me now the contracts are one thing, but it would be communications I 4 5 assume between -- you just don't -- there are obviously 6 communications that accompany contracts. 7 Yeah. And I think the question, Judge, MR. PARIKH: 8 is communications related to subject matter jurisdiction, 9 Again, that's the framework we're talking about here. 10 THE COURT: Right. 11 MR. PARIKH: So if the communications are, well, hey,

you know, this is our platform and we have the ability to help police officers, you know, effectuate their rights under Daniel's Law or under some other privacy law, those communications aren't relevant or even discoverable as it relates to subject matter jurisdiction. And that's part of the issue here, is that we've gotten requests from the defendants that are saying all documents, all communications, without narrowing them as to within the framework of subject matter jurisdiction.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STIO: Your Honor, that's inaccurate.

Your Honor, the issue here is who are the real parties in interest. Even in Mr. Parikh's example there --

THE COURT: Right.

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
1
               MR. STIO: -- that would be relevant.
 2
               Let me tell you how I can allow you to enforce your
 3
              The assignors is a real party in interest.
     rights.
 4
               THE COURT: Right.
               MR. STIO: We should be entitled to communications
 5
 6
     with the PBA.
                   We have one document that shows as far back as
 7
     April of 2023, Atlas was getting assignments and signing up
 8
     people.
 9
               Now, if I were a police officer and I was concerned
10
     that I need my stuff taken down, I would say when are you going
11
     to send the take-down notices? What's the delay? What's going
12
     on?
13
               THE COURT: But what does that have to do with
14
     subject matter jurisdiction?
15
               MR. STIO: It has --
16
               THE COURT: It may be -- and there may be some
17
     impropriety, but that has nothing to do with subject matter
18
     jurisdiction, does it?
19
               MR. STIO: No, it does.
20
               THE COURT: Why?
21
               MR. STIO: Because if the person is saying these are
22
     my rights, these are my interests --
23
               THE COURT: Yeah.
24
               MR. STIO: -- they're the real party in interest.
25
     That goes to the totality of circumstances.
```

What's being lost here is what Long John Silver's and Grassi and their progeny say. They say you look at the totality of circumstances related to the assignment.

All the plaintiffs want to do is give assignment documents and policies that their counsel drafted. And we are entitled to know the circumstances to determine not just if it's a sham, who is the real party in interest, because that is what all the case law says you look at.

THE COURT: Can't you tell that by the contract?

MR. STIO: You can get some of it from the contract,

Your Honor, but not all of it.

THE COURT: Well, the contract sets the rights of the parties, doesn't it, of the assignor and assignee?

MR. STIO: It does set rights of parties, but it's, again --

THE COURT: And don't we have a parol evidence rule?

MR. STIO: Your Honor, Grassi, Long John Silver's

allowed -- those are two. There were others cited in my

letter -- allowed discovery beyond the assignment itself. And
they did that because they want to determine is there an
assignment that's entered into that is used for the sole
purpose of defeating court jurisdiction, who's the real party
in interest.

And this type of information about communications with the PBA is not going to be difficult for them to obtain.

1.5

It goes to the surrounding circumstances and who is the real party in interest.

In all the other cases, *Grassi*, *Long John Silver's*, there's an assignment and the Court still said you're entitled to information about who the real party in interest is. All we're trying to do is get to that.

THE COURT: Of course, isn't behind all this a New Jersey statute which permits assignments?

Now, I know the fact that an assignment may be legal under state law doesn't answer the question. You have to go beyond that. But in none of those other cases do we have a statute which determined it was good public policy in New Jersey to permit these assignments to a company like Atlas to facilitate possible recovery by the individual law enforcement officer.

In other words, for an individual law enforcement officer to sue 50 or 100 databases, that's a pretty burdensome thing for an individual to do, to protect his rights to privacy.

So the Legislature determined that there would be a procedure where these could be assigned. And I assume — obviously I haven't looked at the documents — that the law enforcement officer, if Atlas prevails, will get part of the recovery and Atlas will get part of the recovery. I mean, isn't that the statutory scheme we're talking about here?

```
1
               MR. STIO:
                          So --
 2
               THE COURT: What's so unusual about that?
 3
               MR. STIO: Two points, Your Honor.
 4
               One, there is a statute in place, Daniel's Law.
 5
               THE COURT: I understand.
 6
               MR. STIO: Two, there's a federal statute, CAFA, that
 7
     allows that individual assignor to represent the entire class.
 8
     If there are communications with the PBA that say we want you
 9
     to assign the case to us so that we can pursue it, we have a
10
     Delaware corporation and we can avoid CAFA jurisdiction, I
11
     think that's relevant to a motion -- in opposition to a motion
12
     for remand, because it does show activity related to trying to
13
     defeat the jurisdiction of the federal court.
14
               THE COURT: Well, then, what if there was any
15
     subject -- any document that discussed CAFA, you want it
16
     limited to that?
17
               I mean, I'm -- look, we don't want the tail wagging
18
     the dog here. Discovery has to be proportional, you know.
19
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, they're suing us for
     $19 million.
20
21
               THE COURT: I understand they're suing you.
                                                             But
22
     we're talking about subject matter jurisdiction here.
                                                             We're
23
     not deciding the case on the merits.
24
               MR. STIO: Right. But the case law says we're
25
     entitled to the totality of circumstances, and the plaintiffs
```

are getting up saying let me tell you what those circumstances are.

THE COURT: I understand. But I'm trying to -- the discovery has to be relevant. It has to be proportional. The discovery rules are quite clear on that now. So we have to -- there have to be some bounds to discovery.

MR. STIO: Right.

1.5

THE COURT: And so what I'm trying to do is to see what -- to probe this issue, determine what really is necessary to determine this issue.

I understand totality of the circumstances, but that doesn't mean you have carte blanche to discovery.

MR. STIO: And we're not asking for that, Your Honor. We're asking for discovery related to communications with the PBA and the police unions to sign these up. We're not asking for every single person.

THE COURT: You're saying any communications?

MR. STIO: Related to Atlas' services.

THE COURT: Well, that's everything.

MR. STIO: How is it? No. They came up with, well, what if, you know, we had a contract for someone with PBA who's going to, you know, do the maintenance. We don't want that. But to limit it to CAFA itself, I mean, I think it has to be a little bit broader than that.

How about related to the assignment, any discussion

```
1
     of the assignment? That's the issue here.
 2
               THE COURT: Well, I mean, that's the whole purpose.
 3
     I'm just trying to understand the statutory scheme.
 4
     Legislature determined that the individual police officer or
     law enforcement officer or prosecutor or judge could assign his
 5
 6
     or her claim to Atlas, correct?
 7
               MR. STIO: Correct, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: And that Atlas could bring the action on
 9
     behalf of the individual and that Atlas would get part of any
10
     recovery, and the law enforcement officer would get a portion
11
     of the recovery.
12
               Isn't that the basic scheme?
13
               MR. STIO: The basic scheme, except for I don't think
14
     the statute talks about any type of recovery or splitting --
15
               THE COURT: No. But, I mean, that has got to be --
     the Legislature didn't contemplate you'd assign your claim for
16
17
     free to Atlas and let Atlas recover and the law enforcement
18
     officer get nothing. I mean, let's make -- let's use our
19
     common sense here.
20
               What would be the purpose of doing it if the law
21
     enforcement officer wasn't to get some recovery?
22
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, if the case is about --
23
               THE COURT: No.
                                Look --
24
               MR. STIO: You said what is the purpose. I'm going
25
     to answer.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: What was the -- listen, let's be -- what
 2
     was the purpose of the statute, as you understand it, of the
 3
     assignment?
 4
                          The purpose of the statute?
               MR. STIO:
 5
               THE COURT: Of the assignment.
 6
               MR. STIO: Of the assignment?
 7
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 8
               MR. STIO: To allow the plaintiffs to enforce the
 9
     rights belonging to the --
10
               THE COURT: And why? Why would the Legislature do
11
            Let's be -- let's use our common sense.
12
               MR. STIO: Right. Yeah.
13
               THE COURT: Why would they do that?
14
               MR. STIO: For privacy reasons, Your Honor.
1.5
               THE COURT: For what?
16
               MR. STIO: For privacy reasons, not to allow a
17
     private entity to monetize privacy rights.
18
               Your Honor, this whole scheme here wasn't to take the
19
     names down, to redact information. If it was, they would have
     sent out nondisclosure requests in April of 2023.
20
21
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
22
               MR. STIO: It was about creating a situation of
23
     noncompliance. And we want to know the totality of the
24
     circumstances.
25
               And I don't want to go broad, Your Honor. I'm trying
```

```
1
     to keep it narrow. But we have a document, and they keep
 2
     saying, well, just ask our 30(b)(6) witness. I would like to
 3
     see the documents so that I can have questions.
               THE COURT: Right. I understand. I understand your
 4
 5
     point.
 6
               MR. STIO: Okay.
                                 Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: What about that, Mr. Parikh?
 8
               MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, I mean, all of these
     requests are based on a fiction. We can't forget the fact
 9
10
     that --
11
               THE COURT: No.
                                Wait a minute. You have -- you're
12
     putting the cart before the horse. You say it's fiction.
13
               MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, we can't forget the fact
14
     that we're here because these defendants, the only way that
15
     they were able to remove these cases from state court was to
16
     come up with this concept of collusive joinder, the fact that
17
     somehow Atlas colluded with the police officers, 19,000 of
18
     them, and specifically selected Delaware as a corporate
19
     residency just to avoid these specific defendants being in
     federal court.
20
21
               And remember, there are the other half of the
22
     defendants that we've not sought to remand because they're
23
     properly before the Court.
               And so I say that, Your Honor, because when we talk
24
```

about communications with the PBA and kind of go to that

25

breadth, we have to remember a few different things.

The officers here are the ones that transmitted these requests to the defendants. That happened starting in December of 2023. And it was only after these defendants, as opposed to other companies that complied, these defendants made a choice not to comply with Daniel's Law by removing that information within ten business days. They then had additional time. They had all through January for most of them where they didn't remove that information. And when that occurred finally in February, there were assignments that were issued or assignments that were given to Atlas from these individuals and therefore then lawsuits were filed.

And so when we talk about communications going back to 2023, again, I'm not sure how that gets into relevance related to who the real party in interest is, which is the term they keep using, or how it relates to collusiveness in a manner that is proportional to simply just asking questions of the 30(b)(6) witness. They can ask these questions and say what were your — they're going to ask it anyway, right — what were your discussions with the PBA about subject matter jurisdiction? What were your conversations with the PBA about CAFA? Ask the 30(b)(6) witness those questions. And if through that process at the deposition they discover that there may be other communications and documents, et cetera, then we have that discussion if we reach that point in time.

```
1
               THE COURT: Well, I'm just wondering -- go ahead.
 2
               MR. KIMREY: Your Honor, Blaine Kimrey for Whitepages
 3
     and Hiya again.
 4
               THE COURT: Yes.
 5
               MR. KIMREY: So the opposition is characterizing this
 6
     as just a query into collusiveness and a sham and dastardly
 7
     motives, but that's only one factor in the Grassi, the Long
 8
     John Silver's, and the Attorneys Trust cases.
 9
               The issues that should be subject to discovery are as
10
     follows, and I'm just going to list them out from Long John
11
     Silver's, from Grassi, and from Attorneys Trust.
12
               In Long John Silver's, number one, whether the
13
     assignors may share in the recovery, if any. So that's number
14
     one.
15
               THE COURT: And that we're going to be able to find
16
     out from the contracts, correct? And the assignments are going
17
     to say that officer X gets a certain percentage of any
18
     recovery.
19
               MR. KIMREY:
                            Sure.
20
               THE COURT: Then we would know that.
21
               MR. KIMREY: The contracts themselves should provide
22
     for the contingent fee arrangements, yes, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Yes, right.
24
               MR. KIMREY: Who is funding the litigation, number
25
     two, under Long John Silver's.
```

1 Number three, motive. 2 Now, motive is not dispositive. 3 THE COURT: Right. MR. KIMREY: It's not essential. It's just one of 4 the factors that may be considered. 5 6 THE COURT: Right. 7 But it's not a prerequisite to finding MR. KIMREY: 8 that you should disregard Atlas' Delaware registration for 9 purposes of diversity. The opposition is trying to cast this 10 very narrowly as a collusive joinder situation under 1359, 28 U.S.C., 1359. 11 12 THE COURT: Right. 13 MR. KIMREY: But that's not what's at issue here. 28 U.S.C., 1359 is not what's at issue. By analogy it is, but 14 15 we're not invoking 1359. 16 THE COURT: Right. 17 MR. KIMREY: Because we're not arguing collusive 18 joinder. We're arguing that Atlas should not be considered a 19 real party in interest for purposes of diversity jurisdiction. 20 THE COURT: Right. 21 The next item or factor, fourth factor MR. KIMREY: 22 under Long John Silver's, is whether there is the presence or 23 absence of some independent, preexisting, legitimate interest 24 in the assignee. That factor, Your Honor, is a bridge to 25 Grassi, because Grassi also has that factor within it.

And *Grassi* also adds: The size of the interest assigned; whether the assignor and assignee had separate counsel; whether the assignee's attorney is controlling the litigation; the timing of the assignment; whether the assignment could be considered a sort of contingent fee arrangement; and whether there was a strong likelihood of prejudice against the defendant if citizenship of the assignee was considered for purposes of diversity jurisdiction.

Attorneys Trust then adds two additional factors on top of that. They kind of overlap a little bit, but they do sound phrased a bit differently, whether there were good business reasons for the assignment, and whether any consideration was given to the assignee.

So we've gone through all of the requests for production that Troutman proposed to the opposition.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KIMREY: And we've drawn a line from each one of those to each one of those factors. So they all are relevant to those factors, Your Honor. I understand your proportionality point. I understand you're saying that this is just subject matter jurisdiction discovery and it's not full-blown merits discovery, which totally agree. But all of those requests go to those issues.

And I just, every time I hear the opposition say, oh, how could there be a sham between all these police officers and

Atlas, it's a red flag to me because we're not saying that it's necessarily a sham. It may be. But we don't have to show that it's a sham. We just have to satisfy and address these factors to Your Honor, which are illustrative. Even these are just illustrative, they're not exhaustive.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask this: In number 4, if we talked about communications which relate to subject matter jurisdiction; in other words, not every communication between Atlas and the PBA, but only the Delaware subject matter jurisdiction.

MR. PARIKH: I think -- I mean, Your Honor, in theory that's good. But, for example, if there's communications between Atlas and in this case the PBA saying, you know, so-and-so data broker is located in New Jersey, right? And it has nothing to do with subject matter jurisdiction, but remember part of this was also how to, you know, where do notices get delivered, how do they get delivered. It's a whole product. So if it's that type of contact information, then there may be communications. I'm not sure.

But, again, to me, Your Honor, from a proportional perspective, and I know Mr. Shaw has something to say with respect to what counsel just mentioned so I'll let him go as well, but the most efficient way is for them to just ask the 30(b)(6) witness these questions.

THE COURT: Yeah. But it's always helpful to have

documents on which you can base your question.

MR. PARIKH: I understand. And we're not saying "no" to the documents, Your Honor. I think, you know, for example, they raised this issue of contracts with the unions. It wasn't in our first proposed list of things to provide, and we said, okay, you know what, fine, we'll give those to you, that makes sense.

I think Mr. Shaw had something he wanted to mention as well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I think I hear --

MR. SHAW: If I may, Your Honor, excuse me. I do think the communications relating to assignments goes too far. And I think my colleague just said what do you do with a communication that has an address in it? Would that be within the terms? And that's why we're trying to get some parameters on the terms.

I think Your Honor might have recognized that something that says an address, you know, probably is not responsive, but we don't want to be --

THE COURT: No, it wouldn't be.

MR. SHAW: Right. We don't want to be in that position to have to make those calls necessarily.

But the other thing that I heard from counsel, which
I find very surprising, is that his requests relating to
subject matter jurisdiction are untethered from the statute,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
that somehow they don't have to show collusion. That's the
basis of their motion. 28 U.S.C., 1359, that's their motion.
If he's saying they're not using that anymore, then we should
ask them to stop their motion. I don't know what their motion
is about.
          If it's about CAFA, there are no cases that show that
you get discovery as to the real party in interest under CAFA.
There's none.
          THE COURT: Right.
          MR. SHAW: The Grassi, the other one, that's not part
of it.
          All of these -- all of these factors, so to speak,
are in service of 1359, definition of collusion. That's what
this -- that's what the subject matter -- that's what their
basis of the remand -- of the removal is.
          THE COURT: Yeah. Well, if the communications were
limited -- I'm just throwing it out here -- to any specific
reference to subject matter jurisdiction or CAFA, in other
words, those words would have to be used. I mean, you have to
have some limit. And so that's what we'll do on that.
          Let's move on to number 5.
          MR. STIO: Your Honor, can I just ask one question?
          THE COURT: No. Not -- go ahead, on number 4.
          So it would be contracts or any communications
```

specifically mentioning subject matter jurisdiction or CAFA.

```
1
     All right.
 2
               MR. PARIKH: That's fine, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Number 5.
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, we're fine with these.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Number 5.
 6
               MR. STIO:
                         Subject to what Mr. Christie said, if he
 7
     wants to speak later about that, but that's fine.
 8
               THE COURT: All right.
 9
               How about number 6?
10
               It may be a moot point, according to what the
11
     plaintiffs say, but we --
12
               MR. STIO: Yeah. As long as they confirm it in
13
     writing and our response.
14
               THE COURT: All right. Six.
15
               All right. Now, with respect to requests, you had
16
     certainly a broader listing. Is there anything else you want
17
     to reference in your list dealing with -- I mean, for example,
18
     you talked about --
19
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I can go through those if you
     want me to. I have a list I can walk through.
20
21
               THE COURT: Yeah, your list. Yeah.
22
               MR. STIO: Yeah. If you go to my list.
23
               THE COURT: That would be in addition to the seven
     items here that we talked about?
24
25
               MR. STIO: Yes.
```

THE COURT: All right. I've got that here in front of me. And best to discuss the ones that would be in addition to.

I know one of the items is you want all documents related to communications between Atlas and I guess the Legislature of New Jersey.

MR. STIO: Concerning just the provision on the assignment of claims. If they are going to rely upon it, the Court has referenced it, we would like to know what they are saying with regard to the assignment of claims provision.

THE COURT: You mean whatever they said to a legislator about that provision in the law, is that what you're saying?

MR. STIO: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Parikh.

MR. PARIKH: I don't know what that has to do with subject matter jurisdiction, Your Honor. At the end of the day, you know, there are other defendants in this room whose law firms and whose clients have lobbied the Legislature for all kinds of things, including on Daniel's Law and other privacy-related legislation.

The Legislature decides what it wants to do. In this case they passed a bill, an amendment. This was, I think, the third or fourth amendment to Daniel's Law, and then eventually the Governor's Office reviewed it and signed it.

You know, the idea that there was some type of —
that that process now relates to, you know, whether it's the
real parties in interest, collusive joinder, whatever it may
be, the law is what the law is. And this is where we disagreed
with counsel and we don't have anything to produce because it
doesn't seem relevant to anything related to subject matter
jurisdiction from our perspective.

MR. STIO: Your Honor, it goes to motive. It goes to the CAFA issues. It goes to subject matter jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Well, I don't see the relevance, and I don't see how it's proportional, and I will not require the plaintiffs to produce any documentation related to discussions with the Legislature of New Jersey or the legislators of New Jersey concerning the provisions of Daniel's Law.

MR. STIO: Understood, Your Honor.

Your Honor, number 8, documents about control over the claims, that comes directly from the case law where it says control is a factor under both *Grassi* and *Long John Silver's*. We think that they should --

THE COURT: Yeah. Wouldn't that be included in the contracts and the assignments, who has control of what? It seems to me that would state all that information.

MR. STIO: Again, Your Honor, it's what circumstances were related to getting these people to assign their claims and who is the real party in interest. And I understand there's a

contract, but the case law says it's beyond the contract.

They've acknowledged in their letter that the Long John Silver's factors are relevant. But they say we're not going to give you any documents on it, just ask our 30(b)(6) witness.

And part of discovery, Your Honor, is for us to be able to not only ask the question but to test the veracity of the answer. And what we're being put in a situation by plaintiffs is trust us. And, Your Honor, with all due respect, they started getting these assignments in April of 2023, and they weren't sent until the holidays of Christmas. And they weren't sent because they wanted to create a situation of noncompliance, not compliance. And if there are communications that talk about who controls the interest, what are their rights and there's an explanation of it, we should be entitled to it.

I think it could be narrow, which is control, state court, federal court. I don't think that that's going to come up with an unusual number of hits. And if it does, Your Honor, they can come to us and we'll try to narrow it or we could come back to you. But I do not think that producing that information that is directly related to a factor in Long John Silver's is burdensome, disproportional, and it is highly relevant.

MR. SHAW: Judge, I think this gets to the parol

evidence rule you're talking about. The contract says what the relationship is of the parties, number one.

Number two, he keeps referring to these cases allow you to go outside of it. That's not in this context where the assignments are allowed. That's in the context where a guardian gets rights to pursue a case where it might not have the details of the monetary exchange in the case.

This case, the actual assignments themselves say the relationship of the party, who controls what, and the amount of compensation. It's in the contract itself. We shouldn't have to go and look through, you know, all of the parol evidence essentially, number one.

Number two, he's also suggesting that these assignments took place in mid-2023. That's not correct. They took place after the time period of noncompliance. That's when they took place. That's when the assignment confirmations took place.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHAW: But in any event, it's just too far into the details.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection on 8.

What else do you want, Mr. Stio?

MR. STIO: Again, this goes to the *Long John Silver's* factor, documents related to --

THE COURT: Which number? Which number?

```
1
               MR. STIO: Oh, on mine, it's number 9, Your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: Number 9.
 3
               MR. STIO: Documents related to separate counsel and
 4
     common counsel. That would be, Your Honor, I believe, at a
 5
     minimum, the engagement letters.
 6
               MR. PARIKH:
                            Your Honor, again, this is a question
 7
     they could ask the 30(b)(6) witness.
 8
               From our understanding, with the exception of the
 9
     individual plaintiffs who vary in the cases, so there are, you
10
     know, a group of eight people or so who are individual
11
     plaintiffs that may be assignors in one case and maybe
12
     individual plaintiffs in another where our three law firms
13
     represent those folks, you know, in their capacity as
14
     individual plaintiffs, and in other cases we're representing
15
     Atlas as the assignee of those assignments. But that has a
16
     carve-out. I don't believe there's any common counsel at all.
17
               THE COURT: Well, that should make it easy.
18
               MR. PARIKH: Correct. And so I think --
19
               THE COURT: Why don't we include that. So if that's
20
     an issue, that's not going to require a lot of time and effort,
21
     is it?
22
               MR. PARIKH: Right. And so, Your Honor, we suggested
23
     to counsel they ask this question of the 30(b)(6) witness.
24
     Now, they've gone an extra step and asked for engagement
25
     agreements. I don't think that that's relevant to subject
```

```
1
     matter jurisdiction. Again, if the inquiry relates to whether
     there are common counsel or not and the answer is from the
 2
 3
     30(b)(6) witness no, there's not --
 4
               THE COURT: Well, we have a certain number of
 5
     individual plaintiffs.
 6
               MR. PARIKH: We do.
 7
               THE COURT: And they're being represented by your
 8
     firm; is that correct?
 9
               MR. PARIKH: Correct. Our collective firms, Your
10
     Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Now, and there are only a handful of
12
             I can't remember the exact number.
     those.
13
               MR. PARIKH: Uh-huh.
14
               THE COURT: Is that a problem? Is there any issue
15
     with producing the engagement letters?
16
               MR. PARIKH:
                            I do think so, Your Honor. Well, so
17
     there is an engagement letter -- engagement letters with
18
     respect to Atlas and then with respect to individual
19
     plaintiffs.
20
               THE COURT: Right.
21
               MR. PARIKH: You know, again, I don't -- you know, I
22
     don't -- if the question under the case law relates to whether
23
     there's common counsel or separate counsel and it relates to
     issues of control, what the terms of the engagement are are
24
25
     really irrelevant as to how it relates to terms of control and,
```

```
1
     again, could be accomplished by simply asking questions of a
     30(b)(6) witness.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Well, I know. Let's talk about the --
 4
               MR. SHAW:
                          If I could just --
 5
               THE COURT: Wait a minute. The contracts that exist
 6
     between the individual plaintiffs, what is the arrangement?
 7
     You have the individual plaintiffs, and they are being
 8
     represented by your firm, correct?
 9
               MR. PARIKH: Correct, Your Honor. Correct. They're
10
     represented -- so depending on the case, not all three firms
11
     are in every single case. So my firm and Mr. McGee's firm are
12
     in all of the cases.
13
               THE COURT: Right.
14
               MR. PARIKH: And so the individual plaintiff will
15
     have an engagement I think -- I believe it's with Mr. McGee's
16
     law firm to represent them as it relates to Case No. 1.
17
               Now, if that individual is not a plaintiff in
18
     Case No. 2 and they're an assignor, then there's no engagement
19
     agreement as it relates to that.
20
               THE COURT: All right. Now, how --
21
               MR. SHAW: Your Honor, if I may, that's one problem,
22
     as an individual plaintiff, they're not an assignor.
23
     inquiry here is whether the assignments are collusive, so
24
     that's why we're --
25
               THE COURT: Okay. I understand. Right.
```

```
1
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, could I --
               THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead.
 2
 3
               MR. STIO: It's really difficult for them to argue
     the document I requested is not relevant but you could ask the
 4
 5
     question of a 30(b)(6) witness. It's relevant for both.
 6
               THE COURT: Right. I got it.
 7
               MR. STIO: And we need it to test the veracity of
 8
     what that witness says.
 9
               THE COURT: Yes. Just give me some specific examples
10
     of 9, Mr. Stio, "documents reflecting whether Atlas and the
11
     purported assignors at issue have separate and/or common
12
     counsel."
13
               Now, isn't the issue whether they do have separate
14
     counsel, not all the documentation related to that?
15
               MR. STIO: I'm just asking for the engagement
16
     letters, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Between --
18
               MR. STIO: Who the attorneys are for --
19
               THE COURT: For the 19,000 assignors, right?
20
               MR. STIO: If they have any, if they have counsel.
21
     They may not. But if Atlas has sent out an engagement letter
22
     to 19,000 people for their -- or excuse me.
23
               THE COURT: Well, I don't know whether Atlas would
24
     necessarily know whether they have separate counsel, maybe you
25
     would, all these 19,000.
```

```
1
               MR. PARIKH: I don't -- we don't know, Your Honor.
 2
     mean, I'm sure in other contexts. But as it relates to this
 3
     assignment, I don't believe they do.
               And to answer Mr. Stio's question directly, our three
 4
 5
     law firms have not sent out engagement letters to 19,000 law
 6
     enforcement officers as assignors related to these litigations.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay.
 8
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, what I want to see is, they
     have three law firms. They obviously had to send engagement
 9
10
     letters to Atlas. I suspect they sent engagement letters or
11
     communications to the PBA and the other police associations.
12
     It's not a burden. They said we could ask it, it's relevant on
13
     a 30(b)(6). We should be able to get those documents. It's
     limited.
14
15
               THE COURT: Well, you certainly know law firms have
16
     entered their appearances in these cases, correct?
17
               MR. STIO:
                          They have, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: And you know who they're representing by
19
     the fact that they entered their appearance.
20
               MR. STIO: In these -- in --
21
               THE COURT: In these cases.
22
               MR. STIO: In the case.
23
               THE COURT: Right.
24
               MR. STIO: Yeah.
25
               THE COURT: Now, they are representing Atlas and
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they're representing all the individual plaintiffs, correct? Is that true? All your firms or are there some different here? MR. PARIKH: The Boies Schiller firm, Your Honor, is not in every single case. But other than that, yes, our three law firms represent Atlas and we represent the individual plaintiffs. THE COURT: Okay. So now you're asking about the assignors, is that right, who represents them? MR. STIO: I'm asking about Atlas and the assignors, yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, what do you want to -- tell me specifically what you're -- give me an example. MR. STIO: So there's an RPC provision in New Jersey that says if you have a joint representation of two clients, you have to disclose that and get consent. So to the extent that Atlas' counsel is representing any of the assignors as well, that would be in the engagement letter for a joint representation. I would like to know, because the PBA isn't in this case, but the PBA's fingerprints are all over this case, is there an engagement letter between Atlas' counsel and the PBA? And it goes directly back to this April 5, 2023 solicitation of these people. THE COURT: Well, the PBA is separate from the assignors, right? What are they, all members, is that it?

```
1
     It's like a police union. Is that what you're talking about?
 2
               MR. STIO: Correct. It's the union, Your Honor.
 3
                            The PBA is one of the police unions,
               MR. PARIKH:
 4
     Your Honor, correct.
 5
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 6
               MR. PARIKH: And it is not an assignor. It's just
 7
     the union.
 8
               THE COURT: It's not a party --
 9
               MR. PARIKH: Correct.
10
               THE COURT: -- or assignor, assignee or anything
11
     else?
12
               MR. PARIKH:
                            That's right, Judge.
13
               THE COURT: So the question is what agreement that
14
     Atlas has with the assignors. And obviously that is evidenced
15
     by the assignments, correct?
16
               MR. STIO: It's also evidenced by its counsel, who is
17
               It's evidenced by an engagement letter.
18
               These law firms can look, they have a system, type in
19
     the names, and they can get it up. And I'm sure that when they
     type in the names or they just do "Daniel's Law" or "Atlas"
20
21
     they're going to have other names in that conflict check.
22
     a click of a few buttons. It's not difficult.
23
               THE COURT: Well, the law firms representing Atlas,
24
     are you also representing the assignors?
25
               MR. SHAW: No.
```

```
1
               MR. PARIKH: No, we're not, Your Honor. Other than
 2
     those individual plaintiffs, no.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay.
 4
               MR. STIO: So that's an easy production for them.
 5
     It's a total of nine letters.
 6
               THE COURT: Well, they made a representation here in
 7
     this courtroom before the Court that they are not representing
 8
     the assignors, haven't they?
 9
               MR. STIO: Your Honor --
10
               THE COURT: So they're officers of the court.
11
               MR. STIO:
                          They made a representation last case
12
     management conference that there was only one assignment and
13
     it's up to three now.
14
               THE COURT: Well --
15
               MR. STIO: They have represented to this Court that
16
     it is so important that we need to immediately honor these
17
     nondisclosure requests, and they were holding on to them since
18
     April of 2023. I think I'm entitled to test the veracity of
19
     statements.
20
               MR. PARIKH: It's -- first of all, I take strong
21
     offense to that. Mr. Stio and I practiced in this courthouse
22
     and this courtroom many, many times. And the idea that he
23
     would inflect or claim that any of the lawyers on this side of
24
     the table are acting anything but as like highest quality
```

officers of the court is beyond reproach, Your Honor.

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assignors.

What happened last time with respect to the service terms was we were talking about assignments versus overall service terms. We acknowledged that there were multiple versions. We've offered to produce them. Nobody's hiding the ball here. In terms of our representation of who we represent and who we don't, if they want, have them just ask an interrogatory, Judge, and we'll have Atlas sign an interrogatory that says these are who the lawyers are. Again, this is a fishing expedition that's -- and it's based upon the fact that these defendants realized they didn't have an actual basis under Rule 11 to remove these cases from state court, and now they're grasping at straws to be able to try to find information about --THE COURT: Well, look, we're not going to get into that type of issue here. Mr. Parikh has stated that his firm is not representing any of the assignors; is that correct? Are there any other firms here representing Atlas here? MR. McGEE: Your Honor, Ryan McGee of Morgan & Same answer as Mr. Parikh provided. THE COURT: Which is what? MR. McGEE: We're not representing any of the

```
1
               THE COURT: All right.
 2
               MR. MAO: Go ahead, Adam.
 3
                         Boies Schiller, same answer, Your Honor.
               MR. SHAW:
 4
     We do not represent any of the assignors.
 5
               MR. MAO:
                         That's correct, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. That solves that.
 7
               MR. STIO: Can I make one statement, Your Honor?
 8
               THE COURT: Yes.
 9
               MR. STIO: They are representing at least the Named
     Plaintiffs. They said it.
10
11
               THE COURT: Well, they're not assignors.
12
                         They're not assignors.
               MR. MAO:
13
               MR. STIO: Yes, they are, Your Honor. They may not
14
     be assignors in one case, but they are assignors in the other
1.5
     70 cases.
16
               THE COURT: What they have said is they are -- they
17
     are representing the Named Plaintiffs in all the cases that are
18
     before us. Is that correct?
19
               MR. PARIKH: Correct, Your Honor.
20
               What Mr. Stio is trying to draw a distinction on is
21
     that, you know, Mr. Maldonado may be an individual plaintiff in
22
     30 cases and he's not an individual plaintiff in the other
23
     hundred cases. And so he has assigned, to the extent he had a
     claim in those hundred cases, he would have assigned them to
24
25
     Atlas.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Right.
 2
               MR. PARIKH:
                            I acknowledge, yes, we are representing
 3
     Atlas in that circumstance, but we are representing
 4
     Mr. Maldonado as an individual plaintiff in the other cases.
 5
     Again --
 6
               THE COURT: But not in every case where he may be an
 7
     assignor.
 8
               MR. PARIKH: That is correct.
 9
               THE COURT: If he's just an assignor, you're not
10
     representing him?
11
               MR. PARIKH: Correct.
12
               THE COURT: If he's a Named Plaintiff in the case,
13
     you are representing him?
14
               MR. PARIKH: That is correct, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: And that's the distinction that is being
     made.
16
17
               MR. PARIKH: That is correct.
18
               THE COURT: All right. That's clear on the record.
19
               All right. The next item, Mr. Stio.
20
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I think I got through all of
21
     the document requests.
22
               THE COURT: All right. Now let's turn to the
23
     30(b)(6) topics.
24
               Before we get to that, maybe we'll just take a short
25
             Okay.
     break.
```

```
1
               MR. SHAW:
                          Thank you, Judge.
 2
               MR. STIO:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
               (Recess was taken at 11:05 a.m. until 11:13 a.m.)
 4
 5
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
 6
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
 7
               We will now turn to the topics for the 30(b)(6)
 8
     depositions. And, Mr. Stio, we'll start with the plaintiffs'
 9
     letter which has seven topics. And maybe that's where we ought
10
     to begin.
11
               MR. STIO:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Yeah.
13
                          So the first topic in plaintiffs' letter
               MR. STIO:
14
     is documents produced in response to the categories listed
15
     above insofar as the questions are relevant to subject matter
16
     jurisdiction.
17
               We have no problem as long as that's changed to
18
     "documents that are produced in response to the Court's order."
19
               THE COURT: Yeah.
                                  The Court order, okay. Right.
20
     We'll do that. I mean, that makes sense.
21
               MR. STIO: For B, on their letter, Your Honor, we
22
     would propose that it be changed to Atlas' interests in
23
     Daniel's Law rights being asserted in actions prior to
24
     obtaining the assignments.
25
               THE COURT: What does that mean?
```

```
1
               MR. STIO: Because it's close to what our request is,
 2
     Your Honor. So their request in B is similar to what we have
 3
     in our topic 4. And we would propose we just use our topic 4,
 4
     which is a little bit broader.
 5
               THE COURT: Wait a minute. Topic 4 of your request.
 6
               MR. STIO: Yes, Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Your topics, let me just get that so I
 8
     have it in front of me.
 9
               Mr. Shaw, what about that?
10
               MR. SHAW: I thought that was narrower, so I'm fine
11
     with that. I mean, I thought that request got to whether Atlas
12
     had some underlying interests.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll eliminate B and
14
     we'll insert number 4 for the defendants. All right.
15
               How about C?
16
               MR. STIO: C is no modification necessary, Your
17
     Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. D.
19
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I don't have a modification
     for D.
20
21
               THE COURT: Okay. E.
22
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, E is similar to our topic 1.
23
     We would request that it be our topic 1.
               THE COURT: Mr. Shaw.
24
25
               MR. SHAW: Can you read your topic 1? For some
```

```
1
     reason, we're --
 2
               MR. PARIKH: I don't -- does your letter have a
 3
     topic 1, Mr. Stio, or is it numbered as 2?
 4
               THE COURT: It's number 1. Assignments...
               MR. STIO: I'll pull it up.
 5
 6
                      Our topic 1, I thought, was not in dispute.
 7
               So I'll read it out, though. It is the assignments
 8
     Atlas purportedly obtained from the assignors including, but
 9
     not limited to, when the assignments were obtained, how the
10
     assignments were obtained, the number of assignments obtained,
11
     and the communications about the assignments.
12
               These were all topics they said we could ask the
13
     30(b)(6) witness.
14
               MR. PARIKH: I don't have an issue with that one
1.5
     instead of --
16
               THE COURT: All right. What we'll do is we'll
17
     substitute their Topic No. 1 for your E.
18
               MR. PARIKH:
                            Thank you, Judge.
19
               THE COURT: All right. How about F?
20
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, we're fine with -- well, I
21
     don't like the word "explanation," right? I would like to have
22
     the person who is going to be the corporate designee to testify
23
     about the Daniel's Law services that Atlas purports to provide
24
     to the assignors.
25
               THE COURT: Well, then we'll leave out "explanation
```

```
7
     of" and just say "the services."
               MR. STIO: That's fine.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: All right. How about G?
               MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, just moving back one really
 4
 5
     quickly with respect to what was E on our list and replacement
 6
     number 1.
 7
               THE COURT: Right.
 8
               MR. PARIKH: In their number 1 they talk about
 9
     communications about the assignments. We have no problem with
10
     them asking questions about whether communications exist or
11
     not, but we don't want that to then open the door to document
12
     requests that Your Honor has already ruled about.
13
               THE COURT: Whatever I've ruled on the document
14
     requests is what I've ruled on.
1.5
               MR. PARIKH: Understood.
                                         Thank you, Judge.
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I think we're fine with G.
18
               THE COURT: G is fine. Okay.
               All right. That covers the 30(b)(6) topics. Do you
19
20
     have any additional ones?
21
               MR. STIO: We had additional ones, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
23
               MR. STIO: And we had additional ones because during
24
     the document production, one of their defenses was, well, you
25
     could just ask questions about that, you don't need documents
```

```
1
             I'd like to be able to ask questions on certain things.
 2
               So the first one would be any participation or
 3
     interest in the litigations by the assignors.
                           Where is that? What number is that?
               THE COURT:
 4
 5
               MR. STIO: It's number 6 on mine, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. Any objection to that?
 7
                          It seems like it's subsumed in the --
               MR. SHAW:
 8
               THE COURT: Well, we'll add it on number 6, would be
     Η.
 9
10
               All right. Anything else?
11
               MR. STIO: I have number 7, Your Honor, Atlas'
12
     ability to identify or communicate with any assignor, including
13
     during the litigation, of the litigations.
14
               MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, I don't understand how that
15
     relates to subject matter jurisdiction.
               THE COURT: Yeah. I don't --
16
17
               MR. PARIKH:
                            I mean, at the end of the day, all of
18
     these law enforcement officers are customers. They use the
19
     Atlas platform. All the defendants know that. It's in the
20
     complaint. So their ability to identify or communicate with
21
     them, I'm not really sure what that relates to in terms of --
22
               THE COURT: I don't either. I'm not going to permit
23
     that.
24
               Go ahead.
                          Next one.
               MR. STIO: Communications about involvement in --
25
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Which number is this now?
 2
               MR. STIO: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor. Number 9 on
 3
     mine.
 4
               THE COURT: Right.
 5
               MR. STIO: About the potential or actual lawsuits
 6
     being brought by Atlas.
 7
               And if I can take a step back, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead.
 9
               MR. STIO: The reason we have that in there is,
     again, it goes to the totality of the circumstances, but these
10
11
     service terms are not a document that Atlas has and they go to
12
     Angelo Stio and they say, here, Angelo, read it, sign it,
13
     assign your claims.
14
               The way this works is, this is terms of service
15
     that's on a website. It's a contract by your question.
16
     have the PBA driving their members to go to this website and
17
     click on and accept terms of service, and then they have a
18
     unilateral assignment confirmation that's sent out to the
     individuals that the individual had no control over one way or
19
     another, just sent out. I would like to explore how this
20
21
     process works and what discussion is related to the lawsuits
22
     with the 30(b)(6) witness.
23
               MR. PARIKH: The whole point of the assignment is in
24
     the statute, Judge. We've talked about that. Your Honor has
```

kind of gone through that with Mr. Stio. I'm still not

```
1
     understanding, you know, we're talking -- to have a witness be
 2
     prepared about communications with 20,000 individual people is
 3
     pretty, pretty extraordinary.
 4
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 5
               MR. PARIKH: You know, I don't -- we're not going to
 6
     object if they have general questions related to, you know,
 7
     these topics and the documents that we've already produced.
 8
     But the idea of communications with any assignor about
 9
     potential actual lawsuits brought by Atlas, I mean, we already
10
     dealt with this on the document side of it, it just seems
11
     extraordinary.
12
               THE COURT: All right. I'll sustain --
13
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, can I say one thing?
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
14
15
                          They say there are no communications.
               MR. STIO:
16
     are they objecting to this if I explore it with their witness?
17
               THE COURT: I'm not going to permit that.
18
               Go ahead.
                          Next.
19
               MR. STIO: The responsibility for payment of legal
     fees and expenses associated with the litigation, I think
20
21
     that's subsumed by the service terms. I don't think that
22
     should be objectionable.
23
               MR. PARIKH: I -- if it relates to the service terms
     and what's in the service terms about, you know, the allocation
24
```

of any award and things like that, there's no issue with that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
one, Your Honor, if it's about the responsibility of the
assignors versus Atlas with respect to legal fees. If it
delves into other questions related to what a fee structure
might be or how those things are being designed within Atlas,
then I think that that goes outside of the subject matter
jurisdiction component in the way that this topic is drafted.
          So if it's limited to subject matter jurisdiction
and, you know, the notion of responsibility of legal fees from
Atlas as an assignee versus any legal obligations of the
assignors --
          THE COURT: Yeah. I think that's what you're talking
about, aren't you?
          MR. STIO: But, Your Honor, that topic goes directly
to control and payment of legal fees under the Long John
Silver's factors.
          THE COURT: Well, wouldn't the -- wouldn't the
assignment deal with that?
          MR. PARIKH: It does, Your Honor, correct.
          THE COURT: I mean, it would say, you know, the
police officer is assigning his rights to Atlas.
certainly going to say something about what the assignor's
legal responsibilities are, to pay fees or counsel fees or
costs or anything else, isn't it?
          MR. PARIKH: Correct, Judge.
          THE COURT: Well, then you can ask about whatever
```

```
1
     is -- yeah.
 2
               MR. PARIKH: Absolutely. As it relates to the
 3
     service terms, absolutely.
 4
               THE COURT: Or we do have that -- that's one of the
 5
     topics of discussion, isn't it, service terms?
 6
               MR. PARIKH:
                            It is, Your Honor. That would be under
 7
     topic A, because it's related to the documents being produced.
 8
               THE COURT: Yeah. Wouldn't that take care of it,
     number 1?
 9
10
               MR. STIO: As long as I'm allowed to go down that
     path, Your Honor, it's on the record. That's fine.
11
12
               THE COURT: Well, I assume it's -- you think it's
13
     included in number 1?
14
               MR. PARIKH: It's included in number 1 within the
15
     confines of subject matter jurisdiction, Your Honor. And,
16
     again, this is that gray area.
17
               We didn't agree to this particular topic that was
18
     raised by the defendants because we think the way that they've
19
     crafted this, it goes beyond and that they're seeking to go
     beyond what would be permissible in subject matter jurisdiction
20
21
     discovery. So if it's limited to subject matter jurisdiction
22
     discovery as it relates to legal fees that are --
23
               THE COURT: Well, obviously the whole thing is
24
     related to subject matter jurisdiction.
25
               MR. PARIKH: Of course. Of course.
```

1 THE COURT: That's the whole point. 2 MR. PARIKH: Of course. 3 And I think, Your Honor, so the service terms will 4 lay out -- it has to do with the contrast in terms of the, as they talked about, the real party in interest, so the 5 6 obligations and responsibilities of the assignees versus the 7 obligations and responsibilities of the assignors. 8 And so if those are the questions as it relates to legal fees and obligations, then we have no problem in our 9 10 30(b)(6) witness --11 THE COURT: Yeah. I think you have it in number A, 12 "Documents produced in response to the Court's order, insofar 13 as the questions are relevant to subject matter jurisdiction." 14 So that would include your right to examine about the 15 assignments and the nature of it and who has what 16 responsibilities. All right. I don't think we need to add 17 that. 18 Next one. MR. STIO: And that's it, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. The Court will then enter an 21 order consistent with what's been decided here today. 22 Go ahead. 23 MR. STIO: Your Honor, I thought, was going to 24 revisit the issue of a privilege log and identification of what 25 is being withheld. I don't think Your Honor previously ruled

on that.

THE COURT: No, we haven't resolved that.

MR. PARIKH: I -- we're happy to identify if they are responsive documents that are being withheld under a privilege designation, we're happy to identify that.

I think what my concern was, Your Honor, is when we talk about when there were requests made regarding kind of broad communications, which I don't think Your Honor has allowed, so I think it should be okay for us to provide a privilege log, it's getting into, you know, a specific, you know, couple hundred-page log of emails with lawyers and things like that. So my concern ultimately, Your Honor, really kind of focuses in on the time period again for this.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PARIKH: So if it's that they'd like a privilege log that predates, you know, let's say December 1, 2023, then, you know, we have no issue. We can provide a privilege log as it relates to the document requests.

I think once we get into the time frame that's closer to the litigation, it becomes a lot harder because lawyers were starting to do work as it relates to noncompliance by defendants and a requirement that, you know, that there's unfortunately going to need to be litigation to enforce all of these individuals' rights.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. McGEE: And, Judge, Ryan McGee with Morgan & Morgan for the plaintiffs. If it's okay to address you from here, Judge.

THE COURT: Yeah. All right.

MR. McGEE: I think the other issue is, in any litigation that I've been in for the past six and a half years on the plaintiffs' side, I've never had a defendant produce a privilege log with expediency. That's kind of one of the issues that we're facing here, too, we want to get over. We want to get through with this. We know some of the cases are staying with you, some of them are not. So that was one of the issues that we had with wholesale producing a privilege log.

But I think if we're in this more limited universe, like Mr. Parikh has represented, we can figure something out. But that was, to start the hearing, what our biggest issue was.

MR. STIO: Your Honor, I don't know what that means.

There's a rule in place, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 34. We're asking for a privilege log if they're

withholding documents that the Court ordered them to produce on
the basis of privilege.

THE COURT: Well, of course, the Court never orders them to produce privileged documents. I mean, the discovery rule talks about relevant documents which aren't privileged should be produced. Am I right?

MR. STIO: And it says that you have to have a

```
1
     privilege log, though.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay.
 3
               MR. STIO: And all I'm asking for is let's follow the
 4
     rules.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay.
 6
               MR. STIO: And I understand the order, and we're
 7
     agreeable to it. But I would like to know if anything is being
 8
     withheld from this narrow list that we've identified today.
     It's not a huge list. I don't think it's going to be that
 9
10
     difficult.
11
               THE COURT: All right.
12
               MR. KIMREY: Your Honor, Blaine Kimrey again.
13
     just going to say, in light of the fact that plaintiffs'
14
     counsel has represented that they don't represent the
15
     assignors, the privilege log should not be that burdensome
16
     given how narrow application of privilege would be.
17
               Also, if we can move off the privilege log issue,
18
     Your Honor, I've got a couple other just housekeeping measures.
19
               THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.
20
               MR. KIMREY: One is, there are third-party entities
21
     that have expressed an interest in filing amicus briefs related
22
     to the consolidated motion to dismiss based on the facial
23
     constitutional challenge.
24
               THE COURT: Right.
25
               MR. KIMREY:
                            That's due on June -- the main brief is
```

```
1
     due on June 10th.
 2
               THE COURT: 10th. Yes.
 3
               MR. KIMREY: Then there is a schedule thereafter.
               THE COURT: Right.
 4
 5
                            I assume, Your Honor, you'd like to see
               MR. KIMREY:
 6
     from those who would like to file -- and I don't have anyone
 7
     secured yet. There are several people in the hopper or several
 8
     entities. You'd like to see a motion for leave with the actual
 9
     amicus brief attached. When would you like to set a deadline
10
     for motions for leave to file amicus briefs in light of the
11
     schedule for briefing by the parties on these issues?
12
               THE COURT: Better do it soon.
                                               They're due the
13
     10th of June. So if they're going to file them, we'd have to
14
     have it by the 10th of June, correct?
15
                            Well, they won't have seen the brief yet
               MR. KIMREY:
16
     by the 10th of June.
17
               THE COURT: I know. So -- oh, they want to -- they
18
     want to do it after?
19
               MR. KIMREY: After it, yes.
20
               In federal -- in appellate court, Your Honor, as you
21
     know, it's a seven-day rule. I was hoping that maybe we could
22
     have a little bit more than that for potential motions for
23
     amicus relief, something to follow the overall schedule. So I
24
     don't know, what is the last deadline in the briefing schedule?
25
               THE COURT: I have it here.
```

```
1
               MR. KIMREY:
                            I'm sorry, Your Honor. I should have
 2
     that in front of me.
 3
               THE COURT: I think the 10th of June, and then
     there's a -- I think the 14th of June, isn't there, for
 4
 5
     individual briefing?
 6
               MR. KIMREY:
                            There is supplemental briefs and --
 7
               MR. STIO: The 14th, and 30 days, I believe, after
 8
     for the opposition.
 9
               THE COURT: Yeah. Sometime in July the opposition
     brief is due.
10
11
               MR. PARIKH: Yeah. I think it's July 15th, Your
12
     Honor.
13
               THE COURT: July 15th, yeah.
14
               So what are you proposing, I enter an order?
15
               MR. KIMREY: July 31st.
               THE COURT: For what? You mean --
16
17
               MR. KIMREY: For motions for leave to file amicus.
18
               THE COURT: July 31st?
19
               MR. SHAW: How are we going to -- first of all, I
     don't know whether the Court even wants amicus for these
20
21
     issues, number one.
22
               But number two, how would we address that if it's
23
     20 days after our brief is due?
24
               MR. KIMREY: How about 21 --
25
               THE COURT: Well, how many amicus briefs are in the
```

```
1
     window?
 2
               MR. KIMREY:
                            There might be zero, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: How many?
 4
               MR. KIMREY: But it could be three to four possibly.
 5
               THE COURT: And what groups are these that are
 6
     interested in filing amicus briefs?
 7
               MR. KIMREY: What are the groups?
 8
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 9
               MR. KIMREY: The ACLU New Jersey, which is litigating
     Kratovil, has filed a petition for cert to the New Jersey
10
11
     Supreme Court, although that's an as-applied challenge.
12
     Possibly the Electronic Frontier Foundation. Possibly the
13
     Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press. Possibly -- what
14
     else is in there? Entities along those lines. Largely, First
15
     Amendment, Sunshine-related entities.
16
               THE COURT: So, I mean, why shouldn't we deal with
17
     it, have it in the next couple of weeks, any motions?
18
               MR. KIMREY: Couple weeks after June 10th?
19
               THE COURT: Well, no. I'm just thinking from now.
20
     mean, they obviously know what the issues are all about. It's
21
     no surprise.
22
               MR. KIMREY: They're all nonprofits with very short
23
     staffs, so.
24
               THE COURT: They must have known about this before
25
     now.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. KIMREY:
                      If ultimately you say June 10th, Your
Honor, we'll live with that.
                             We'd at least like another seven
days beyond that to match --
          THE COURT: In other words, to file a brief or to --
         MR. KIMREY: To file a motion for leave to file the
        Because you may ultimately look at the amicus brief
and say you don't want to grant leave. I mean, hopefully you
would grant leave.
         MR. PARIKH: Your Honor, I would suggest that perhaps
you just set June 14th as the date. They'll then have days to
view the merits brief.
         THE COURT: To file their petition.
         MR. PARIKH: To file their -- I believe their motion
for leave to appear as amicus has to attach their proposed
amicus brief as part of it.
          THE COURT: Right. Right.
         MR. PARIKH: But that gives them -- we all know what
the issues are already as we sit here today, so they can
prepare them. They can see whatever main briefs --
          THE COURT: All right. I'll consider that and enter
an order of some sort.
         MR. KIMREY:
                      Okay.
          THE COURT: I'll either do it today or tomorrow.
         MR. KIMREY: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
         Another point. It's been suggested that the interest
```

underlying Daniel's Law is privacy. The Legislature's articulated interest is actually safety. So I just wanted to make that clear on the record.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KIMREY: It's judicial, in other covered persons, safety. It's not actually -- the Legislature, as far as I'm aware, has never articulated the privacy interest. It's the safety interest, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. SHAW: Your Honor, briefly, I think as counsel has admitted, privacy is one of the central issues. Defense counsel has admitted that.

Getting back to the privilege log. One of the issues we have, Your Honor, is, you know, the statute says that Daniel's Law cases can and may be filed in New Jersey. So at some point in time, Atlas is discussing with its lawyers about filing in New Jersey, I mean, even going through the process of where is the particular court that we're going to file and those kinds of things. That's going to -- if we have to somehow amass that information and put it into a privilege log, I don't know whether he --

THE COURT: Well, it seems obvious that you would be filing a case in the state of New Jersey involving a New Jersey statute, involving New Jersey law enforcement personnel. Where

```
1
     else would you file it?
               MR. SHAW: Well, exactly.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: You wouldn't file it in California.
               MR. SHAW: But they want a privilege log with all
 4
 5
     that information on it. That's what the point is.
 6
               THE COURT: Mr. Stio?
 7
               Obviously they're going to file the case in New
 8
     Jersey, isn't it? Where else would you file it?
 9
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, my request was a privilege
10
     log, Your Honor. I don't know when -- I don't have the
11
     engagement letter.
                         I don't know when the engagement started.
12
     So all I want is a privilege log if they are withholding a
13
     document from the list that Your Honor ordered them to produce.
14
               We have gone from formal requests and we were going
15
     to put it in an order, and we're fine with that, but the reason
16
     I wanted the formal request, because formal requests provide
17
     for -- I get to know what is being produced, I get to know what
18
     is being withheld, and I should know what the basis for
19
     withholding is.
20
               I don't think that this is a huge burden,
21
     specifically as to subject matter jurisdiction, because our
22
     requests have been narrowed significantly.
23
               THE COURT: Well, of course, they -- isn't the
24
     opposing party always entitled to a privilege log?
25
               MR. PARIKH:
                            They are, Your Honor. But because of
```

the breadth of what we're talking about and the time frame, the time frame again I think is the issue, right? Because we're talking about 140 cases, right?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PARIKH: And parsing out, you know, we can't parse out communications related to these specific remand defendants as opposed to kind of a broader group with respect to some of these topics.

I would propose, Your Honor, that kind of a middle-of-the-road approach would be that if we withhold records in response to these categories that are within Your Honor's order on the basis of privilege, that we say to them we've withheld the records on the basis of privilege and then we meet and confer and figure out whether a privilege log for that category is feasible or not feasible based upon the volume.

So if it's a request, a document request that may relate to communications and it would require us to spend one month putting together a privilege log of tens of thousands of emails amongst counsel and their clients, then we can have that conversation and say we just think this is not proportional here, we've withheld documents between counsel and Atlas, you know, in this relevant time period from production versus if it's something, as Mr. Stio has talked about, that goes back to service terms from January of 2023, and there is three emails

that we're withholding on privilege, then of course we can provide a privilege log with respect to that.

THE COURT: What I'll do is with respect to that is require counsel to meet and confer and then get back to me, say, within a week. And then we'll see where we are on that. And then depending on what you say, we may have to have another conference to deal with that subject, but we won't let things otherwise be delayed.

All right. Now, let's talk about scheduling of all this. You know the categories of documents to be produced. What do you propose is the timetable for producing all this, Mr. Parikh?

MR. PARIKH: So I think, Your Honor, we can get all these documents over to the defendants within three weeks with the new categories. We might be able to do it within two, but I think three weeks, absolutely, we can get it done. And obviously, if we can get it done sooner, then that's great.

THE COURT: So you're saying the 24th of June?

MR. PARIKH: Correct.

THE COURT: How about the 30(b)(6)? I mean, obviously, the defendants — well, oh, I should have asked all those sitting here in the courtroom, with respect to the topics for production, anybody else want to say anything? Mr. Stio has been carrying the laboring oar on that. Anybody have any further comments on that, or on the Rule 30(b)(6) topics?

```
1
               (No response.)
 2
               THE COURT: All right. Documents to be produced by
 3
     the 24th of June. And then you need some time, Mr. Stio, and
 4
     your colleagues to review the documents. What would you
 5
     propose as a timetable for a 30(b)(6) deposition?
 6
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I propose three weeks just
 7
     because I would like to share them with the joint defense
 8
     group.
 9
               THE COURT: Okay. That's the 24th of June, that
     would be 15th of July.
10
11
               MR. STIO: Yes, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: So we'll say the deposition, the 30(b)(6)
13
     deposition would be after the 15th of July. Does that make
14
     sense?
15
               MR. PARIKH: Yeah. I would say if it's after the
     15th of July, that's fine with us, Judge.
16
17
               THE COURT: Yeah, after. After July.
18
               Well, maybe we should say on or before the 31st of
19
     July.
20
               MR. PARIKH: That's fine, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: That will give you -- yes, sir.
22
               MR. McGEE: I think that's fine, Judge. I just know
23
     that myself and Mr. Lee will be -- he's not here right now. We
24
     have multiple hearings in other cases toward the end of July,
25
     but we'll work with defense counsel and figure something out.
```

```
1
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, I am fine if they want to do
 2
     August 7th, if that will work.
 3
               MR. McGEE: It actually gets into other hearings that
 4
     we have on August 7th. So I would prefer July, just as long as
 5
     we've got some leeway in scheduling, Judge.
 6
               THE COURT: I would say on or before July 31st.
 7
            And then let's talk about the briefing. We have
 8
     July 31st for the final deadline. And let's just see here, the
 9
     31st, how about the 21st of August? Is that too much time for
10
     the opposition brief?
11
               MR. PARIKH:
                            I think the oppositions will be the
12
     defense, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Yeah, I know.
14
               MR. STIO: Your Honor, the issue with that is
15
     vacations and 34 parties to coordinate with. I'd like to have
16
     30 days.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. That would be -- make it
18
     August 30th.
19
               MR. STIO: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Now, as we did before, with respect to
21
     the facial challenge, we'll say a consolidated brief would be
22
     due the 30th of August with a -- like a seven-day window for
23
     individual briefs, which shouldn't duplicate the other briefs.
24
     And we'll work out the specific dates in an order.
```

But we'll follow the same format as we did earlier.

```
1
               MR. STIO:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: And then in terms of your reply brief?
 3
               MR. PARIKH: I would think 30 days should be
 4
     sufficient, Judge.
 5
               THE COURT: You need 30 days, all right. That would
 6
     be -- we'll say September 30th.
 7
               MR. PARIKH:
                            Thank you, Judge.
 8
               THE COURT: And then we'll also enter the order on
 9
     the amicus. That will be a separate order relating to that.
10
               MR. KIMREY: Thank you, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Is there anything else we need to do
12
     today?
13
               Yes, sir.
               MR. CHRISTIE: Your Honor, thank you.
14
15
               Your Honor, mindful of your discussion earlier today
16
     to parse out subject matter jurisdiction from other issues, I'd
17
     just like to revisit with the Court the issue of plaintiffs'
18
     unwillingness to provide the actual redaction emails.
19
               We have a covered persons list that they've provided.
     We've reviewed it carefully. It contains thousands of names
20
21
     that we do not believe -- from people who we do not believe
22
     sent these suppression emails. We want to make sure that we
23
     cover --
               THE COURT: Now, my understanding is Atlas sends
24
25
     information to you to be redacted; is that correct? I mean,
```

```
1
     that's --
 2
               MR. CHRISTIE: Well, actually, no. The covered
 3
     persons themselves --
 4
               THE COURT: They send --
 5
               MR. CHRISTIE: -- through the Atlas --
 6
               THE COURT: Network.
 7
               MR. CHRISTIE: Platform, yes.
 8
               THE COURT: And so?
 9
               MR. CHRISTIE: So the problem is, Judge, they've
10
     provided these covered persons lists.
11
               THE COURT: Who is it?
12
               MR. CHRISTIE: Atlas did, pursuant to Your Honor's
13
     prior order.
14
               THE COURT: Yeah, right.
15
               And these are people that Atlas says you have in your
16
     system and that you're disclosing information about the
17
     individuals; is that correct?
18
               MR. CHRISTIE: Atlas' view is that these covered
19
     persons list include all of the individuals who sent the data
20
     suppression requests months ago.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Right.
22
                              We've carefully reviewed those lists
               MR. CHRISTIE:
23
     and compared it to the emails that we received. And it is not
24
     a situation that plaintiff is mentioning where they have been
25
     caught in spam and we don't know what they are with regard to
```

```
1
     the names. So we've gotten rid of the spam issue.
 2
               Based upon the totality of the analysis, our
 3
     perception is that there are thousands of names that are
     included on these lists of individuals who did not send the
 4
 5
     suppression emails several months ago.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay.
 7
               MR. CHRISTIE: We have come to the conclusion that
 8
     Atlas is now trying to expand the list of the so-called
 9
     suppression requests by virtue of these covered persons
10
     lists --
11
               THE COURT:
                           Right.
12
               MR. CHRISTIE: -- to include individuals who did not
13
     send the emails several months ago which gave rise --
14
               THE COURT:
                           To you?
1.5
               MR. CHRISTIE:
                              To my clients, yes.
16
               THE COURT: Well --
17
               MR. PARIKH: And I've said this to counsel, Your
18
     Honor, I've offered to meet and confer on this issue with him.
19
     This goes to merits discovery. The covered persons list that
20
     we provided to Black Knight and to every other defendant is the
21
     list that Atlas says. Atlas says this is a list of individual
22
     covered persons who transmitted a request to your client.
23
     We've identified in the complaint an email address or email
24
     addresses that those requests were sent to.
25
               If they don't have those emails on their systems,
```

that's a -- that's an issue on their system. So if they want to engage in merits discovery, have us start doing forensic examinations of their systems, have depositions of whether their person checked the spam filter regularly or not, we're happy to engage in that. That would be a waiver of personal jurisdiction argument, of course. And that is what I've said to counsel. I've said, look, you -- as Your Honor had said, they can choose to take this list and use it as a compliance tool or not. That's up to each one of these defendants whether they want to comply.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PARIKH: And that's the stage of the case that we're in.

And so Black Knight has a list, it has the names of all the individuals, it has the information that they've requested to be redacted. Now, with Your Honor's order, because they're a remand defendant, they're also going to get the date of the assignments and they're going to get a categorization of whether that person is a judge, a judicial officer or law enforcement officer, a prosecutor, or a family member, and they can choose whether or not to take that information and redact it or not.

And if eventually months from now in merits discovery they have evidence that these requests were never transmitted, then they're going to move to dismiss that assignment or that

```
1
     particular claim with respect to their case or we'll stipulate
 2
     to it.
 3
               But from my perspective, Judge, the issue of whether
     or not they received something, it's not a function of what was
 4
 5
     done through the Atlas system. It's a function of what they
 6
     did in their computer systems or what they did not do to comply
 7
     with the law.
 8
               THE COURT: I think it's best to try to meet and
     confer with them and deal with that issue. I can't deal with
 9
10
     that today, all right?
11
               MR. PARIKH: All right.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you.
13
               MR. CHRISTIE: Okay. The only thing, Judge, we're
14
     asking for the emails themselves. It shouldn't be unduly
15
     burdensome. And unfortunately --
16
               THE COURT: Because we may be getting into the
17
     merits, and that's the other issue here that we're dealing
18
            And I think we have enough on our plate with the
19
     constitutional challenge and the remand at this point.
     Everything else, as you know, is stayed.
20
21
               MR. CHRISTIE:
                              Understood, Judge.
22
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
23
               MR. CHRISTIE: All right. Thank you.
24
               THE COURT: Anything else?
25
               Yes, ma'am.
```

```
1
               MS. HUTCHINS: Good morning, Your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: Good morning.
 3
               MS. HUTCHINS: My name is Sarah Hutchins. S-A-R-A-H,
 4
     Hutchins, H-U-T-C-H-I-N-S.
 5
               THE COURT: Yes.
 6
               MS. HUTCHINS: And I represent BlackBaud,
 7
     Incorporated. And I just wanted to raise for Your Honor, based
 8
     on what I heard you say a moment ago, that you're going to
 9
     consider the parties' briefing limits with respect to remand.
10
     And just ahead of that decision, I wanted to raise what I
11
     understood from the last hearing, which was I guess more
12
     opportunity for the defendants to have unique briefing because
13
     the remand issues are a bit unique. For example, my client has
     only moved on CAFA, has not moved on collusive issues.
14
1.5
               And so what I understood last time was that the Court
16
     was considering 25 pages for any defendant that wished to
17
     submit their own brief. And I just remind Your Honor of that
18
     potential discussion.
19
               THE COURT: Yeah. I didn't discuss the page limit,
     but I assume we'd follow the same format. Do you have any
20
21
     objection to that?
22
               MS. HUTCHINS: No, Your Honor. Just more opportunity
23
     then with respect to the constitutional briefing --
24
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
25
               MS. HUTCHINS: -- to have increased page limits for
```

```
1
     those that are going outside of the consolidated briefing.
 2
               THE COURT: Because of unique circumstances?
 3
               MS. HUTCHINS: Because of unique circumstances.
               MR. SHAW: I'm not aware -- everyone moved on the
 4
 5
     basis of CAFA. So that's not a unique circumstance. That's
 6
     actually the circumstance.
 7
               MS. HUTCHINS: I don't think that's correct.
                                                              I don't
 8
     think every defendant has moved on the basis of CAFA.
 9
               MR. SHAW: Well, the consolidated briefing is going
10
     to be on collusion.
11
               THE COURT: Right.
12
               MR. SHAW: And CAFA.
13
               THE COURT: Right.
14
               MR. SHAW: So to me, the central briefing is
15
     collusion and CAFA. So I'm not sure what the supplement is
16
     separate from CAFA, if CAFA is part of the main.
17
               THE COURT: In other words --
18
               MS. HUTCHINS: Your Honor, my client did not move on
19
     collusive, so using up our page limits for that --
20
               THE COURT: Well, I understand. But the point is, if
21
     the consolidated brief deals with two issues and you have only
22
     one issue, then there wouldn't be any need to file a
23
     supplemental brief unless that one issue that you're interested
24
     in is not adequately dealt with.
25
               MS. HUTCHINS: Correct, Your Honor. And I would also
```

```
1
     put forth that my CAFA arguments are unique than some of the
 2
     other defendants with respect to the Rule 20 analog.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MS. HUTCHINS: And I've recently amended my removal
 4
 5
     to raise issues as to the assignment date.
 6
               So, again, and I'm just one defendant.
                                                        I'm sure
 7
     other defendants feel that their arguments are unique as well.
 8
     So when Your Honor was considering this issue before, I
 9
     interpreted the discussion to acknowledge that the issues could
10
     be more unique with respect to remand than with respect to the
11
     constitutional briefing.
12
               THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll extend the page
13
     limit somewhat then on that.
14
               MS. HUTCHINS:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
1.5
               THE COURT: All right. Yes, sir.
16
               MR. CHEIFETZ: Good morning, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Good morning.
18
               MR. CHEIFETZ: David Cheifetz from Hogan Lovells on
19
     behalf of The Lifetime Value Companies.
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
               MR. CHEIFETZ: Given the hour, I'll try to be brief.
22
     Just two points, please, Your Honor. One is substantive, one
23
     is more in the nature of housekeeping.
24
               We've heard some representations today, Your Honor,
25
     that the requests here for take-down notices were sent by the
```

covered persons. And it's my client's position, and I think the position of many other defendants, that, in fact, the requests here were actually sent by Atlas. And that's going to become an important point later on. I just wanted to be clear for the record that my client's position is that, in fact, requests here were improperly sent by Atlas and not the covered persons themselves.

And two, with respect to the 30(b)(6) deposition, I just want to clarify, will all defendants who wish to participate be given the opportunity to participate in that deposition, or will we have to work out some sort of procedure where those that wish to participate ask for permission to do so?

THE COURT: Well, I would hope that -- we can't have, you know, 40 lawyers. That would be quite a nightmare. I'm just --

MR. CHEIFETZ: Nobody wants that.

THE COURT: I think -- I would hope we can work out some system where maybe we have a couple of attorneys who could work together to do the questioning. The deposition, I think, should be limited to eight hours.

Is there any reason not to do that? 30(b)(6) at this point.

MR. PARIKH: Seven hours under the rules, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Or seven hours.

```
1
               MR. PARIKH: Yes. What we --
 2
               THE COURT: I meant seven hours.
 3
               Well, what do you propose?
 4
               MR. CHEIFETZ: I just wanted to be clear for the
 5
     record that any defendant who wishes to participate can, I
     suppose, meet and confer among ourselves, but there's really no
 6
 7
     limitation placed by the Court on the number of attorneys --
 8
               THE COURT: I would hope that you would be able to
 9
     work out something so that we don't have 40 lawyers examining
10
     the 30(b)(6) witness.
11
               MR. SHAW: Yeah. And I think we talked about last
12
     time setting up a place, whether we could accommodate a number
13
     of attorneys, and then also have some kind of Zoom or virtual.
14
               THE COURT: Yeah.
15
               MR. SHAW: One thing I just want to make clear is,
16
     this is not every defendant, it's just the remand defendants.
17
     I'm not sure if you're --
18
               MR. CHEIFETZ: Correct. I represent defendants
19
     subject to the potential remand.
20
               THE COURT: Yeah. It's obviously remand.
                                                         Well,
21
     that's why I say 40 as opposed to 70-something.
22
               MR. SHAW: Yeah. Right.
23
               THE COURT: So, Mr. Stio, maybe since you have so
24
     many of these defendants, we'd have to work out, and with
25
     plaintiffs' counsel, work out a location for the deposition
```

```
1
     maybe by Zoom. And other defense counsel could at least --
 2
               MR. STIO: We'll do that, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: -- participate remotely. And work with
     some of the defendants as to who's going to take the deposition
 4
 5
     and maybe the small group or whatever.
 6
               MR. STIO: Yeah. We talked about that last time.
 7
     We'll try to get a small like committee to do it.
 8
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 9
               MR. CHEIFETZ: Okay. Thank you very much.
10
               THE COURT: Let's see if you can do that. If there's
11
     a problem, obviously let me know.
12
               MR. CHEIFETZ: I don't anticipate there will be a
13
               I've been working closely with Mr. Stio.
     problem.
14
               THE COURT: No. Obviously, I don't want to exclude
15
     anybody from participation.
16
               MR. CHEIFETZ: Right. I just wanted to make sure
17
     that the Court was amenable to others participating.
18
               THE COURT: Yes.
19
               MR. CHEIFETZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Thank you.
21
               Is there anything else we need to do for the good of
22
     the order today?
23
               MR. STIO: Nothing from the defense.
24
               THE COURT: I will get the order entered in the next,
25
     if not today, tomorrow. So we'll full steam ahead. Thank you
```

```
1
     very much.
 2
               MR. SHAW: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
               MR. STIO: Thank you, Your Honor.
               MR. McGEE: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
 5
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
 6
                (Proceedings concluded at 11:54 a.m.)
 7
              FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
 8
 9
            I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
10
     from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
11
12
13
     /S/John J. Kurz, RDR-RMR-CRR-CRC
                                                    June 6, 2024
14
     Court Reporter/Transcriber
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| | T | T | 1 | 1 |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | MS. HUTCHINS: [11] | 1:24-cv-04045-HB [1] | 9/7 | 2 |
| MR. CHEIFETZ: [10] | 102/1 102/3 102/6 102/22 | | 1:24-cv-04256-HB [1] | 20 [1] 104/2 |
| 104/16 104/18 104/21 | 102/25 103/3 103/7 | 1:24-cv-04073-HB [1] | 9/12 | 20 days [1] 88/23 |
| 105/17 106/4 106/18 | 103/18 103/25 104/4 | 2/21 | 1:24-cv-04261-HB [1] | 20,000 [1] 80/2 |
| 107/9 107/12 107/16 | 104/14 | 1:24-cv-04075-HB [1] | 9/17 | 201 [1] 16/9 |
| 107/19 | THE COURT: [336] | 3/3 | 1:24-cv-04269-HB [1] | 2023 [22] 22/14 22/18 |
| MR. CHRISTIE: [20] | THE COURTROOM | 1:24-cv-04077-HB [1] | 9/21 | 31/24 32/6 32/7 32/14 |
| 38/6 38/9 38/12 39/8 | DEPUTY: [4] 19/4 74/3 | 3/8 | 1:24-cv-04271-HB [1] | 32/20 34/10 34/23 35/4 |
| 39/13 40/5 97/14 98/2 | 74/5 108/5 | 1:24-cv-04080-HB [1] | 10/3 | 41/3 41/10 43/7 49/20 |
| 98/5 98/7 98/9 98/12 | \$ | 3/12 | 1:24-cv-04288-HB [1] | 51/4 51/14 61/10 62/14 |
| 98/18 98/22 99/7 99/12 | | 1:24-cv-04095-HB [1] | 10/7 | 68/22 70/18 84/16 93/25 |
| 99/15 101/13 101/21 | \$19 [1] 46/20 | 3/17 | 1:24-cv-04292-HB [1] | 2024 [5] 1/14 33/16 35/4 |
| 101/23 | \$19 million [1] 46/20 | 1:24-cv-04096-HB [1] | 10/12 | 41/10 108/13 |
| MR. KIMREY: [43] | / | 3/22 1:24-cv-04098-HB [1] | 1:24-cv-04298-HB [1] 10/16 | 21 [1] 88/24 |
| 27/3 27/6 27/11 27/19 | /S/John [1] 108/13 | 4/3 | 1:24-cv-04299-HB [1] | 21st [1] 96/9 |
| 27/21 28/3 28/7 28/12 | | 1:24-cv-04103-HB [1] | 10/21 | 222 [1] 16/21 |
| 52/2 52/5 52/19 52/21 | 0 | 4/8 | 1:24-cv-04324-HB [1] | 24th of [3] 94/18 95/3 |
| 52/24 53/4 53/7 53/13 | 07052 [1] 16/12 | 1:24-cv-04104-HB [1] | 11/3 | 95/9 |
| 53/17 53/21 54/17 86/12 | 07102 [2] 17/7 17/24 | 4/12 | 1:24-cv-04345-HB [1] | 25 [1] 102/16 |
| 86/20 86/25 87/3 87/5 | 08101 [1] 1/13 | 1:24-cv-04105-HB [1] | 11/7 | 28 [1] 57/2 |
| 87/15 87/19 88/1 88/6 | 08542 [1] 17/19 | 4/17 | 1:24-cv-04354-HB [1] | 28 U.S.C [2] 53/11 53/14 |
| 88/15 88/17 88/24 89/2 | 08543 [1] 16/16 | 1:24-cv-04106-HB [1] | 11/12 | 2800 [1] 17/13 |
| 89/4 89/7 89/9 89/18 | | 4/21 | 1:24-cv-04380-HB [1] | 28202 [1] 18/3 |
| 89/22 90/1 90/5 90/22 | 1 | 1:24-cv-04107-HB [1] | 11/16 | 2a [1] 35/2 |
| 90/24 91/5 97/10 | 100 [2] 17/7 45/17 | 5/3 | 1:24-cv-04383-HB [1] | 2nd [1] 31/2 |
| MR. MAO: [3] 72/2 72/5 72/12 | 10017 [1] 17/11 | 1:24-cv-04110-HB [1] | 11/21 | 3 |
| MR. McGEE: [7] 71/21 | 10018 [1] 17/3 | 5/8 | 1:24-cv-04385-HB [1] | 30 [41] 16/3 21/13 21/15 |
| 71/24 85/1 85/5 95/22 | 101 [1] 16/12 | 1:24-cv-04111-HB [1] | 12/3 | 21/20 21/25 24/1 24/3 |
| 96/3 108/4 | 1037 [1] 17/23 | 5/12 | 1:24-cv-04389-HB [1] | 25/25 26/16 28/18 41/22 |
| MR. PARIKH: [93] | 105 [1] 17/19 | 1:24-cv-04112-HB [1] | 12/7 | 41/23 50/2 51/18 51/22 |
| 19/7 28/24 29/1 29/5 | 10th [4] 87/1 87/2 89/18 | 5/17 | 1:24-cv-04390-HB [1] | 55/24 61/4 63/7 63/23 |
| 29/11 29/24 30/10 30/24 | 90/1 | 1:24-cv-04113-HB [1] | 12/12 | 64/3 65/2 66/5 67/13 |
| 32/17 32/19 33/6 33/20 | 10th of [4] 87/13 87/14 | 5/22 | 1:24-cv-04392-HB [1] | 72/22 73/23 74/7 76/13 |
| 34/6 34/12 35/11 36/14 | 87/16 88/3 11 [1] 71/12 | 1:24-cv-04114-HB [1] | 12/17 | 77/19 79/22 83/10 88/7 |
| 36/23 37/6 40/6 40/19 | 11:05 [1] 74/4 | 6/3 | 1:24-cv-04434-HB [1] | 94/20 94/25 95/5 95/12 |
| 40/22 41/15 41/18 42/7 | 11:13 [1] 74/4 | 1:24-cv-04141-HB [1] 6/7 | 12/21 | 96/16 97/3 97/5 105/8 |
| 42/11 50/8 50/13 55/11 | 11:54 a.m [1] 108/6 | 1:24-cv-04143-HB [1] | 1:24-cv-04442-HB [1] 13/3 | 105/22 106/10 |
| 56/2 58/2 59/16 63/6 | 12207 [1] 16/3 | 6/12 | 1:24-cv-04447-HB [1] | 30-plus [1] 37/13 |
| 63/18 63/22 64/6 64/9 | 12th [1] 16/3 | 1:24-cv-04160-HB [1] | 13/7 | 300 [1] 17/19 |
| 64/13 64/16 64/21 65/9 | 1359 [6] 53/10 53/11 | 6/16 | 1:24-cv-04566-HB [1] | 301 [1] 16/16 |
| 65/14 67/1 68/3 69/3 69/6 | 53/14 53/15 57/2 57/13 | 1:24-cv-04168-HB [1] | 13/12 | 30th [2] 96/18 97/6 |
| 69/9 69/12 70/1 70/20 | 140 [1] 93/3 | 6/21 | 1:24-cv-04571-HB [1] | 30th of [1] 96/22 |
| 72/19 73/2 73/8 73/11 | 140-plus [1] 29/22 | 1:24-cv-04171-HB [1] | 13/17 | 31st [6] 88/15 88/18 |
| 73/14 73/17 76/2 76/14 | 14th [1] 88/7 | 7/3 | 1:24-cv-04609-HB [1] | 95/18 96/6 96/8 96/9 |
| 76/18 77/4 77/8 77/15 | 14th of [1] 88/4 | 1:24-cv-04174-HB [1] | 13/21 | 32nd [1] 17/3 |
| 78/14 78/17 79/23 80/5 80/23 81/18 81/24 82/2 | 1520 [1] 17/23 | 7/8 | 1:24-cv-04664-HB [1] | 330 [1] 17/13 33602 [1] 16/9 |
| 82/6 82/14 82/25 83/2 | 15th [2] 88/11 88/13 | 1:24-cv-04175-HB [1] | 14/3 | 34 [7] 19/18 24/7 24/18 |
| 84/3 84/15 88/11 90/9 | 15th of [3] 95/10 95/13 | 7/12 | 1:24-cv-04696-HB [1] | 26/24 30/9 85/18 96/15 |
| 90/13 90/17 92/25 93/5 | 95/16 | 1:24-cv-04176-HB [1] | 14/7 | 35 [1] 36/23 |
| 94/13 94/19 95/15 95/20 | 16 [1] 36/16 | 7/17 | 1:24-cv-04770-HB [1] | 35,000 [1] 36/6 |
| 96/11 97/3 97/7 99/17 | 17 [1] 36/16 | 1:24-cv-04178-HB [1] | 14/12 | 390 [1] 17/10 |
| 100/12 101/11 105/24 | 18,000 [1] 36/16 | 7/21 | 1:24-cv-04850-HB [1] | |
| 106/1 | 19,000 [7] 36/8 36/16 | 1:24-cv-04181-HB [1] | 14/16 | 4 |
| MR. SHAW: [32] 19/6 | 50/17 66/19 66/22 66/25 67/5 | 8/3 | 1:24-cv-04949-HB [1] | 40 [3] 105/15 106/9 |
| 20/12 20/15 25/22 26/4 | 1:24-cv-03993-HB [1] | 1:24-cv-04182-HB [1] | 14/21 | 106/21 |
| 26/8 26/16 56/11 56/21 | 1/4 | 8/7 | 1:24-cv-05334-HB [1] 15/3 | 40,000 [3] 36/6 36/15 |
| 57/10 61/25 62/19 65/4 | 1:24-cv-03998-HB [1] | 1:24-cv-04184-HB [1] 8/12 | 1:24-cv-05600-HB [1] | 36/23 |
| 65/21 69/25 72/3 74/1 | 1/8 | 1:24-cv-04217-HB [1] | 15/8 | 400 [1] 16/16 |
| 75/10 75/25 78/7 88/19 | 1:24-cv-04000-HB [1] | 8/16 | 1:24-cv-05656-HB [1] | 41st [1] 16/6 |
| 91/11 92/2 92/4 103/4 | 2/3 | 1:24-cv-04227-HB [1] | 15/12 | 44 [1] 16/6 |
| 103/9 103/12 103/14 | 1:24-cv-04037-HB [1] | 8/21 | 1:24-cv-05658-HB [1] | 4th [1] 1/13 |
| 106/11 106/15 106/22 | 2/7 | 1:24-cv-04230-HB [1] | 15/17 | 5 |
| 108/2 MR. STIO: [146] | 1:24-cv-04041-HB [1] | 9/3 | 1:24-cv-05775-HB [1] | 50 [1] 45/17 |
| MS. CHUDEREWICZ: | 2/12 | 1:24-cv-04233-HB [1] | 15/21 | 576-7094 [1] 1/22 |
| [1] 19/9 | | | | |
| [-] 17/7 | | | 1 | 1 |

| ase 1.24-0v-04324- |
|--|
| 6 |
| 60601 [1] 16/21 60611 [1] 17/14 620 [2] 17/3 18/3 6SENSE [1] 4/14 |
| 7 |
| 70 [1] 72/15 70-something [1] 106/21 7094 [1] 1/22 7th [3] 16/9 96/2 96/4 |
| 8 |
| 800 [1] 18/3 856 [1] 1/22 |
| 9 |
| 94104 [1] 16/6 9:57 [1] 1/14 9:57 a.m. as [1] 19/3 |
| A |
| a.m [4] 1/14 74/4 74/4 108/6 |
| a.m. [1] 19/3 ability [3] 42/12 78/12 78/20 |
| able [9] 25/18 50/15 52/15 61/7 67/13 71/13 78/1 94/15 106/8 |
| above [2] 74/15 108/10 |
| above-entitled [1] 108/10 |
| absence [1] 53/23 |
| absolutely [4] 26/3 82/2 82/3 94/16 |
| accept [1] 79/17 |
| accommodate [1] 106/12 |
| accompany [1] 42/6 accomplished [1] 65/1 |
| according [2] 24/15 |
| 58/10 ACCURATE [1] 7/23 ACCUZIP [1] 11/22 |
| acknowledge [2] 73/2 104/9 |
| acknowledged [2] 61/2 71/3 |
| ACLU [1] 89/9 |
| acting [1] 70/24 action [73] 1/3 1/7 2/2 |
| 2/6 2/11 2/15 2/20 3/2 3/7 |
| 3/11 3/16 3/21 4/2 4/7 4/11 4/16 4/20 5/2 5/7 |
| 5/11 5/16 5/21 6/2 6/6 |
| 6/11 6/15 6/20 7/2 7/7 |
| 7/11 7/16 7/20 8/2 8/6 8/11 8/15 8/20 9/2 9/6 |
| 9/11 9/16 9/20 10/2 10/6 |
| 10/11 10/15 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/11 11/15 11/20 |
| 12/2 12/6 12/11 12/16 |
| 12/20 13/2 13/6 13/11 |
| 13/16 13/20 14/2 14/6 14/11 14/15 14/20 15/2 |
| 15/7 15/11 15/16 15/20 |
| 48/8 |

actions [1] 74/23

activity [2] 29/21 46/12 actual [6] 62/8 71/11 79/5 80/9 87/8 97/18 actually [10] 27/6 28/3 36/4 38/19 91/2 91/6 96/3 **also [18]** 18/5 19/12 98/2 103/6 105/3 **ACXIOM [2]** 5/4 16/17 **Ad [1]** 17/20 **ADAM [3]** 16/2 20/12 72/2 **ADAMS [1]** 18/2 add [5] 27/1 30/15 39/3 78/8 83/16 added [1] 23/23 **addition [3]** 31/6 58/23 59/2 **additional [9]** 28/22 39/3 39/21 39/22 51/7 54/9 77/20 77/21 77/23 address [8] 36/20 39/13 55/3 56/14 56/18 85/2 88/22 99/23 addresses [1] 99/24 adds [2] 54/1 54/9 **adequately [1]** 103/24 admit [1] 22/2 **admitted** [2] 91/12 91/13 advantage [1] 20/6 advising [1] 29/5 **after [15]** 23/15 24/3 26/11 33/16 51/4 62/15 87/18 87/19 88/7 88/23 89/18 95/13 95/15 95/17 95/17 **afterwards** [1] 33/25 again [22] 28/7 35/6 41/20 42/9 44/15 51/14 52/3 55/20 60/23 62/23 63/6 64/1 64/21 65/1 71/9 73/5 79/10 82/16 84/13 86/12 93/2 104/6 against [1] 54/7 **ago** [4] 98/20 99/5 99/13 102/8 agree [4] 27/11 27/24 54/22 82/17 agreeable [1] 86/7 **agreement** [2] 65/19 69/13 agreements [1] 63/25 ahead [16] 25/21 27/5 32/18 52/1 57/23 66/2 72/2 77/22 78/24 79/8 80/14 80/18 83/22 86/19 102/10 107/25 aided [1] 1/23 al [139] **Albany** [1] 16/3 **ALESCO [1]** 15/14 all [125] alleged [1] 36/4 ALLIANCE [1] 4/4 **allocation** [1] 80/24 allow [4] 43/2 49/8 49/16 62/3 **allowed** [5] 44/18 44/19 62/5 82/10 84/9 60/5 60/6 69/10 70/24

allows [1] 46/7 along [2] 30/20 89/14 already [5] 23/11 77/12 80/7 80/9 90/18 27/21 32/2 37/24 37/25 40/21 53/25 54/1 55/16 62/13 69/16 69/24 86/17 97/8 100/17 103/25 106/13 **although** [1] 89/11 always [3] 25/13 55/25 92/24 **am [3]** 27/14 85/24 96/1 amass [1] 91/21 **amenable** [1] 107/17 amend [1] 40/1 amended [6] 33/11 33/16 34/7 35/9 39/24 104/4 **amending** [1] 35/6 **amendment** [3] 59/23 59/24 89/15 **AMERICA [2]** 11/4 17/16 **AMERICAN** [1] 15/4 **AMERILIST** [1] 15/23 amicus [13] 86/21 87/9 87/10 87/23 88/17 88/20 88/25 89/6 90/6 90/6 90/14 90/15 97/9 among [1] 106/6 amongst [1] 93/20 **amount** [4] 20/25 21/9 29/15 62/9 analog [1] 104/2 analogy [1] 53/14 analysis [4] 30/1 30/17 34/15 99/2 **ANGELO [3]** 16/15 79/12 79/12 another [5] 63/12 79/20 90/2 90/25 94/6 answer [7] 45/10 48/25 61/8 64/2 67/4 71/22 72/3 **anticipate** [1] 107/12 any [52] 22/24 23/18 23/20 24/11 24/18 24/19 25/15 26/10 28/9 33/2 33/11 39/11 39/23 39/24 46/14 46/15 47/17 47/25 48/9 48/14 52/13 52/17 54/12 57/17 57/24 60/12 61/4 62/19 63/16 64/14 66/20 68/17 70/23 71/18 71/19 71/24 72/4 77/20 78/2 78/6 78/12 80/8 80/25 81/9 85/5 89/17 94/24 102/16 102/20 103/22 105/22 106/5 anybody [5] 26/21 27/1 94/23 94/24 107/15 assignee's [1] 54/3 anymore [1] 57/3 assignees [1] 83/6 anyone [3] 25/4 26/20 assigning [1] 81/20 assignment [31] 20/18 anything [16] 25/11 26/21 27/1 40/18 58/16

78/10 81/23 86/7 94/23 97/11 101/24 107/21 anyway [1] 51/19 **Apartment [1]** 17/23 appear [1] 90/14 **appearance** [1] 67/19 appearances [4] 16/24 17/25 18/8 67/16 **appellate** [1] 87/20 **APPEND** [1] 7/23 **application** [1] 86/16 applied [1] 89/11 approach [1] 93/10 **appropriate** [2] 35/19 38/23 April [10] 22/14 22/18 23/1 32/7 41/3 43/7 49/20 61/10 68/22 70/18 **April 5 [3]** 32/7 41/3 68/22 April 5th saying [1] 23/1 are [138] area [1] 82/16 aren't [3] 42/15 81/12 85/23 argue [2] 40/9 66/3 arguing [3] 21/17 53/17 53/18 argument [2] 28/22 100/6 **arguments** [3] 40/15 104/1 104/7 arrangement [2] 54/6 65/6 arrangements [1] 52/22 articulated [2] 91/2 91/7 **as-applied** [1] 89/11 ask [24] 24/9 25/20 26/16 41/22 50/2 51/18 51/19 51/22 55/6 55/23 57/4 57/22 61/4 61/7 63/7 63/23 66/4 67/12 71/7 76/12 77/25 78/1 81/25 105/12 asked [4] 21/2 38/20 63/24 94/21 asking [14] 23/9 25/6 47/13 47/14 47/15 51/17 65/1 66/15 68/7 68/9 77/10 85/18 86/3 101/14 asks [1] 25/25 asserted [1] 74/23 assertion [1] 26/2 assign [5] 46/9 48/5 48/16 60/24 79/13 **AXLE [1]** 8/4 assigned [4] 45/21 54/2 72/23 72/24 assignee [8] 44/13 53/24 54/2 54/7 54/13 63/15 69/10 81/9

21/9 21/10 21/11 34/4

35/15 37/23 44/3 44/4

44/19 44/21 45/4 45/9

47/25 48/1 49/3 49/5 49/6 54/4 54/5 54/12 59/8 59/10 62/16 67/3 70/12 79/18 79/23 81/17 100/25 104/5 assignments [31] 21/7 21/8 22/19 26/13 37/20 43/7 45/8 45/13 51/10 51/11 52/16 56/12 60/21 61/10 62/5 62/8 62/14 63/15 65/23 69/15 71/2 74/24 76/4 76/7 76/9 76/10 76/10 76/11 77/9 83/15 100/18 assignor [11] 44/13 46/7 54/2 65/18 65/22 69/6 69/10 73/7 73/9 78/12 80/8 assignor's [1] 81/21 assignors [30] 35/25 36/8 36/11 43/3 52/13 63/11 66/11 66/19 67/6 68/8 68/9 68/17 68/25 69/14 69/24 70/8 71/18 71/25 72/4 72/11 72/12 72/14 72/14 76/8 76/24 78/3 81/2 81/10 83/7 86/15 **associated** [1] 80/20 associations [1] 67/11 assume [6] 30/25 42/5 45/21 82/12 87/5 102/20 **assumption** [1] 21/1 **ATDATA [2]** 13/9 16/17 **ATLAS [135] Atlas' [7]** 47/18 53/8 68/16 68/21 74/22 78/11 98/18 attach [1] 90/14 attached [1] 87/9 **Attachment** [1] 18/8 attorney [1] 54/3 attorneys [8] 26/1 52/8 52/11 54/9 66/18 105/19 106/7 106/13 **August [5]** 96/2 96/4 96/9 96/18 96/22 **August 30th [1]** 96/18 **August 7th [2]** 96/2 96/4 **Avenue** [3] 17/3 17/10 17/13 avoid [2] 46/10 50/19 award [1] 80/25 aware [3] 26/10 91/7 103/4

B

back [17] 27/13 28/8 31/23 32/6 32/9 34/4 41/2 41/20 43/6 51/13 61/21 68/22 77/4 79/7 91/14 93/24 94/4 **ball [1]** 71/5 **BARTLE [2]** 1/16 19/2 base [1] 56/1 based [12] 27/17 38/14 38/19 38/25 39/4 41/7

BLACK [6] 9/9 17/8 17/8

38/10 99/20 100/14 **Black Knight** [1] 100/14 BLACKBAUD [3] 1/5 18/4 102/6 **BLAINE [4]** 16/20 27/3 52/2 86/12 blanche [1] 47/12 blocks [1] 37/14 **blown [3]** 29/14 30/11 54/22 board [1] 37/3 **BOIES** [4] 16/2 16/5 68/3 capacity [1] 63/13 72/3 **Boland** [1] 16/12 bombardment [1] 39/21 both [2] 60/18 66/5 **Boulevard** [1] 17/23 **bounds** [1] 47/6 breadth [2] 51/1 93/1 break [1] 73/25 bridge [1] 53/24 brief [16] 86/25 87/9 87/15 88/10 88/23 90/4 90/6 90/11 90/15 96/10 96/21 97/2 102/17 103/21 103/23 104/21 **briefing [14]** 19/12 24/4 28/19 87/11 87/24 88/5 96/7 102/9 102/12 102/23 103/1 103/9 103/14 104/11 **briefly** [1] 91/11 **briefs** [8] 86/21 87/10 88/6 88/25 89/6 90/19 96/23 96/23 bring [1] 48/8 **broad [3]** 22/10 49/25 84/8 broader [4] 47/24 58/16 75/4 93/7 broker [1] 55/14 brought [2] 79/6 80/9 **Building** [1] 1/12 **burden [3]** 20/22 67/12 92/20 burdensome [5] 22/1 45/17 61/23 86/15 101/15 **business** [2] 51/7 54/12 buttons [1] 69/22 **CAFA** [18] 46/6 46/10 46/15 47/23 51/22 57/6 57/7 57/18 57/25 60/9 102/14 103/5 103/8 103/12 103/15 103/16 103/16 104/1 **California** [2] 16/6 92/3

46/9 46/10 50/3 51/18 56/1 57/22 58/19 58/20 61/20 69/18 69/19 72/7 75/25 79/7 80/13 81/25 84/17 85/14 86/17 90/18 90/19 91/16 93/20 94/1 94/13 94/16 94/17 100/8 100/21 105/18 106/5 107/10 can't [7] 44/9 50/9 50/13 64/12 93/5 101/9 105/14 CAPTION [14] 1/19 2/25 3/25 4/25 5/25 6/25 7/25 8/25 9/25 10/25 11/25 12/25 13/25 14/25 CARCO [2] 3/9 16/17 care [1] 82/8 carefully [2] 97/20 98/22 **Carnegie** [1] 16/16 **Carolina** [1] 18/3 carries [1] 32/1 carrying [1] 94/24 cart [1] 50/12 carte [1] 47/12 carve [1] 63/16 carve-out [1] 63/16 case [38] 23/11 27/25 33/3 33/5 33/23 34/2 34/8 34/14 44/8 46/9 46/23 46/24 48/22 55/13 59/23 60/17 61/1 62/6 62/7 62/8 63/11 64/22 65/10 65/11 65/16 65/18 67/22 68/4 68/20 68/20 70/11 72/14 73/6 73/12 91/24 92/7 100/12 101/1 Case No [1] 65/18 cases [28] 22/5 23/11 29/19 29/22 33/8 33/22 45/3 45/11 50/15 52/8 57/6 62/3 63/9 63/14 65/12 67/16 67/21 71/12 72/15 72/17 72/22 72/23 72/24 73/4 85/10 91/16 93/3 95/24 cast [1] 53/9 categories [6] 29/3 29/13 74/14 93/11 94/10 94/15 categorization [2] 37/25 100/19 category [4] 25/7 29/6 34/13 93/15 caught [1] 98/25 Center [2] 16/16 17/6 centers [1] 19/11 **central** [2] 91/12 103/14 cert [1] 89/10 **certain** [6] 23/25 24/16 26/23 52/17 64/4 78/1 **certainly [3]** 58/16 67/15 81/21 certainty [1] 19/25 can [47] 19/25 23/22 24/9 **CERTIFICATE** [1] 108/7 certify [1] 108/9

challenge [5] 40/20 86/23 89/11 96/21 101/19 **changed** [3] 34/3 74/17 74/22 characterizing [1] 52/5 **Charlotte** [1] 18/3 **chart** [2] 35/18 37/22 check [1] 69/21 checked [1] 100/4 **CHEIFETZ [2]** 17/10 104/18 Chicago [2] 16/21 17/14 **choice** [1] 51/5 choose [2] 100/8 100/21 **CHOREOGRAPH** [1] 10/4 **CHRISTIE** [6] 17/6 35/14 35/22 38/4 38/9 58/6 **Christmas** [2] 32/5 61/11 CHUDEREWICZ [1] 16/15 **circuit** [1] 34/6 circumstance [3] 73/3 103/5 103/6 circumstances [13] 22/6 43/25 44/3 44/6 45/1 46/25 47/1 47/11 49/24 60/23 79/10 103/2 103/3 **circumvent** [1] 27/16 cited [1] 44/18 citizenship [1] 54/7 Citrus [1] 17/20 CIVIL [74] 1/3 1/7 2/2 2/6 2/11 2/15 2/20 3/2 3/7 3/11 3/16 3/21 4/2 4/7 4/11 4/16 4/20 5/2 5/7 5/11 5/16 5/21 6/2 6/6 6/11 6/13 6/15 6/20 7/2 7/7 7/11 7/16 7/20 8/2 8/6 8/11 8/15 8/20 9/2 9/6 9/11 9/16 9/20 10/2 10/6 10/11 10/15 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/11 11/15 11/20 12/2 12/6 12/11 12/16 12/20 13/2 13/6 13/11 13/16 13/20 14/2 14/6 14/11 14/15 14/20 15/2 15/7 15/11 15/16 15/20 85/17 **claim** [5] 48/6 48/16 70/23 72/24 101/1 claiming [4] 20/3 20/4 25/11 25/19 claims [5] 59/8 59/10 60/17 60/24 79/13 **clarify** [2] 27/21 105/9 **CLARITAS** [1] 7/14 class [1] 46/7 **clear [8]** 40/10 40/17 47/5 73/18 91/3 105/4 106/4 106/15 Clerk [1] 18/7 click [2] 69/22 79/17 **client** [**5**] 30/17 36/19 99/22 102/13 103/18

client's [3] 36/5 105/1

105/5 clients [4] 59/19 68/14 93/20 99/15 close [1] 75/1 closely [1] 107/13 closer [1] 84/19 CO [2] 14/18 17/11 **Cohen** [1] 1/12 **colleague** [1] 56/13 colleagues [1] 95/4 collective [1] 64/9 College [1] 17/19 Colligan [1] 22/25 **COLLINS** [1] 17/13 colluded [2] 20/22 50/17 **collusion [8]** 21/4 22/6 22/12 33/25 57/1 57/13 103/10 103/15 collusive [7] 50/16 53/10 53/17 60/3 65/23 102/14 103/19 collusiveness [2] 51/16 52/6 **come** [6] 22/15 50/16 61/18 61/20 61/20 99/7 comes [1] 60/17 coming [3] 19/10 25/24 32/22 Commencing [1] 1/14 comments [1] 94/25 **COMMERCE** [1] 6/18 COMMERCIAL [1] 2/22 **committee** [2] 89/13 107/7 common [7] 48/19 49/11 63/4 63/16 64/2 64/23 communicate [2] 78/12 78/20 communicating [1] 41/3 communication [2] 55/8 56/14 communications [42] 14/22 22/9 22/21 22/25 30/18 41/2 41/2 41/19 41/21 42/4 42/6 42/8 42/11 42/15 42/18 43/5 44/24 46/8 47/14 47/17 50/25 51/13 51/24 55/7 55/12 55/19 56/12 57/16 57/24 59/5 61/13 67/11 76/11 77/9 77/10 78/25 80/2 80/8 80/15 84/8 93/6 93/18 companies [2] 51/5 104/19 **company** [1] 45/13 **compared** [1] 98/23 **comparison** [1] 38/15 compensation [1] 62/10 complaint [9] 33/24 34/17 34/20 34/21 34/23 36/7 39/17 78/20 99/23 complaints [2] 36/5 39/24 **compliance** [2] 61/13

cetera [2] 30/14 51/24

25/10 25/25 28/18 51/23

depositions [3] 24/1 74/8

95/5 95/12 95/13 105/8

105/11 105/20 106/25

107/4

100/3

62/20

44/20 47/9 47/10

96/25 98/12 99/4 99/12

27/23 27/23 37/15 48/16

51/8 71/11 82/17 102/19

101/6 101/6 103/18

37/4 51/1 68/2

69/22 86/10

67/4 68/22 81/13

19/14 23/20 24/18 24/24

45/20 48/4

Case 1:24-cv-04324-HB

compliance... [1] 100/8 **complied** [1] 51/5 comply [4] 37/7 51/6 100/10 101/6 **component** [1] 81/6 computer [2] 1/23 101/6 computer-aided [1] 1/23 concept [1] 50/16 concern [3] 38/19 84/6 84/12 concerned [2] 27/14 43/9 concerning [2] 59/7 60/14 **concluded** [1] 108/6 conclusion [1] 99/7 confer [5] 93/14 94/4 99/18 101/9 106/6 **conference** [**6**] 1/5 19/11 20/17 31/21 70/12 94/7 conferences [1] 37/2 confers [1] 28/4 **confines** [1] 82/15 confirm [1] 58/12 confirmation [2] 35/16 79/18 confirmations [1] 62/16 conflict [1] 69/21 consent [1] 68/15 consider [2] 90/20 102/9 consideration [1] 54/13 considered [4] 53/5 53/18 54/5 54/8 **considering** [2] 102/16 104/8 **consistent** [1] 83/21 consolidated [5] 86/22 96/21 103/1 103/9 103/21 constitutional [4] 86/23 101/19 102/23 104/11 constrained [1] 32/9 construes [1] 30/21 contact [1] 55/18 contains [1] 97/20 **contemplate** [1] 48/16 context [4] 20/21 20/22 62/4 62/5 contexts [1] 67/2 contingent [2] 52/22 54/5 **continue** [1] 35/12 continued [18] 1/19 2/25 3/25 4/25 5/25 6/25 7/25 8/25 9/25 10/25 11/25 12/25 13/25 14/25 16/24 17/1 17/25 18/1 contract [11] 22/24 41/12 44/9 44/10 44/12 47/21 61/1 61/1 62/1 62/10

79/15

contracts [10] 41/6 41/20

42/4 42/6 52/16 52/21

56/4 57/24 60/21 65/5

control [8] 60/16 60/18

controlling [1] 54/3

60/21 61/17 64/24 64/25

contrast [1] 83/4

79/19 81/14

controls [2] 61/14 62/9 conventions [1] 32/7 **Conversant** [1] 17/20 conversation [1] 93/21 conversations [1] 51/21 **conversed** [1] 38/18 **Cooper** [1] 1/13 **coordinate** [1] 96/15 copies [1] 35/15 CORELOGIC [2] 9/4 16/18 **CORP [3]** 10/13 14/13 17/16 **corporate** [2] 50/18 76/22 **corporation** [**79**] 1/3 1/7 2/2 2/6 2/11 2/15 2/20 3/2 3/7 3/11 3/14 3/16 3/21 4/2 4/7 4/11 4/16 4/20 5/2 70/21 5/7 5/11 5/16 5/18 5/21 6/2 6/6 6/11 6/15 6/20 7/2 70/22 94/22 7/7 7/11 7/16 7/20 8/2 8/6 courts [1] 20/8 8/11 8/15 8/20 9/2 9/6 9/11 9/16 9/20 9/23 10/2 10/6 10/11 10/15 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/11 11/15 11/20 12/2 12/6 12/11 12/16 12/20 13/2 13/6 13/11 13/16 13/20 14/2 14/6 14/11 14/15 14/20 15/2 15/5 15/7 15/11 15/16 15/20 16/17 17/15 46/10 correct [39] 24/19 25/1 40/22 41/8 48/6 48/7 52/16 59/14 62/14 63/18 64/8 64/9 65/8 65/9 65/9 67/16 68/1 69/2 69/4 69/9 69/15 71/18 72/5 72/18 72/19 73/8 73/11 73/14 73/17 81/18 81/24 87/14 94/19 97/25 98/17 103/7 103/25 106/18 108/9 **corridor** [2] 40/13 40/16 Cosma [1] 18/7 **COSTAR [3]** 5/14 17/14 17/14 costs [1] 81/23 could [26] 20/6 20/19 21/9 21/14 37/9 45/21 48/5 48/8 54/5 54/25 61/17 61/20 63/7 65/1 65/4 66/1 66/4 67/12 76/12 77/25 87/21 89/4 104/9 105/19 106/12 107/1 counsel [36] 18/8 23/12 27/15 40/7 44/5 54/3 55/22 56/23 60/5 63/3

63/4 63/16 63/23 64/2

64/23 64/23 66/12 66/14

66/20 66/24 68/16 68/21

69/16 69/17 81/22 86/14

106/25 107/1

86/18 89/17 89/18 105/19 course [8] 45/7 82/25 82/25 83/2 85/21 92/23 94/1 100/6 court [39] 1/1 1/21 19/1 20/24 20/25 22/15 23/14 23/19 26/22 27/7 32/10 44/22 45/4 46/13 50/15 50/20 50/23 59/9 61/18 61/18 70/7 70/10 70/15 70/25 71/12 74/19 83/20 85/19 85/21 87/20 88/20 89/11 91/19 97/17 102/15 106/7 107/17 108/7 108/14 Court's [2] 74/18 83/12 **courtesy** [1] 37/9 courthouse [2] 1/12 **courtroom** [4] 18/6 70/7 cover [1] 97/23 **covered** [16] 36/7 38/13 38/20 38/25 39/4 39/5 91/5 97/19 98/2 98/10 98/18 99/9 99/19 99/22 105/1 105/6 covers [1] 77/19 crafted [1] 82/19 CRC [1] 108/13 create [3] 23/2 29/24 61/12 creating [1] 49/22 CRR [1] 108/13 crunched [1] 38/14 **custodians** [1] 30/13 **customers** [1] 78/18 cv [72] 1/4 1/8 2/3 2/7 2/12 2/16 2/21 3/3 3/8 3/12 3/17 3/22 4/3 4/8 4/12 4/17 4/21 5/3 5/8 5/12 5/17 5/22 6/3 6/7 6/12 6/16 6/21 7/3 7/8 7/12 7/17 7/21 8/3 8/7 8/12 8/16 8/21 9/3 9/7 9/12 9/17 9/21 10/3 10/7 10/12 10/16 10/21 11/3 11/7 11/12 11/16 11/21 12/3 12/7 12/12 12/17 12/21 13/3 13/7 13/12 13/17 13/21 14/3 14/7 14/12 14/16 14/21 15/3 15/8 15/12 15/17 15/21 D **Daniel's [12]** 37/7 42/14 46/4 51/6 59/20 59/24

60/14 69/20 74/23 76/23 91/1 91/16 **dastardly** [1] 52/6 data [84] 1/3 1/7 2/2 2/6 2/11 2/15 2/20 3/2 3/7 3/11 3/16 3/21 4/2 4/7 4/11 4/16 4/20 5/2 5/7 5/11 5/16 5/21 6/2 6/6 6/11 6/13 6/15 6/20 6/22

57/13

53/8 55/9

delayed [1] 94/8

delves [1] 81/3

depends [1] 24/24

deposition [13] 24/3

delivered [2] 55/17 55/17

DELUXE [2] 3/14 16/17

DELVEPOINT [1] 3/23

7/2 7/4 7/7 7/11 7/16 7/18 7/20 8/2 8/4 8/6 8/11 8/15 8/20 9/2 9/6 9/11 9/16 9/20 10/2 10/6 10/11 10/13 10/15 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/11 11/15 11/20 12/2 12/6 12/11 12/16 **Deputy** [1] 18/6 12/20 13/2 13/6 13/11 designation [1] 84/5 13/13 13/16 13/20 14/2 designed [1] 81/4 14/6 14/11 14/15 14/20 **designee** [1] 76/22 15/2 15/7 15/11 15/16 desire [1] 29/13 15/20 17/20 38/20 39/1 **details [3]** 40/8 62/7 55/14 98/19 databases [1] 45/17 **determine** [5] 21/9 44/6 date [8] 31/23 32/22 34/16 37/23 39/16 90/10 **determined** [3] 45/12 100/18 104/5 dates [2] 37/19 96/24 determining [1] 21/3 dating [1] 32/6 developed [2] 33/3 33/7 **DAVID [2]** 17/10 104/18 **did** [**10**] 28/8 44/20 96/20 day [5] 41/18 59/18 78/17 87/21 96/22 days [8] 51/7 88/7 88/23 didn't [10] 25/22 26/9 90/3 90/10 96/16 97/3 97/5 deadline [4] 28/17 87/9 **different** [5] 37/2 37/3 87/24 96/8 deal [11] 23/25 32/15 different entity [1] 37/4 39/10 39/11 40/1 40/2 **differently** [1] 54/11 81/17 89/16 94/7 101/9 difficult [4] 44/25 66/3 101/9 dealing [3] 35/1 58/17 **DIGITAL** [2] 6/9 14/13 101/17 **direction** [1] 20/16 deals [2] 28/13 103/21 **directive** [1] 40/10 **dealt [2]** 80/10 103/24 directly [5] 60/17 61/22 **December [3]** 30/4 51/3 84/16 disagreed [1] 60/4 **December 1 [1]** 84/16 disclose [1] 68/15 decided [2] 19/17 83/21 disclosing [2] 24/6 98/16 decides [1] 59/22 discover [1] 51/23 deciding [1] 46/23 discoverable [1] 42/15 decision [1] 102/10 discovery [27] 19/11 defeat [1] 46/13 **defeating** [1] 44/22 **defendant** [13] 17/11 18/4 36/17 37/1 54/7 85/7 99/20 100/17 102/16 103/8 104/6 106/5 106/16 defendants [116] defense [8] 28/9 29/13 91/12 95/7 95/25 96/12 107/1 107/23

26/22 28/14 38/23 39/14 44/19 46/18 47/4 47/5 47/6 47/12 47/14 52/9 54/21 54/22 57/7 61/6 82/21 82/22 85/22 99/19 100/2 100/23 discuss [2] 59/2 102/19 discussed [1] 46/15 **discussing** [1] 91/17 defenses [1] 77/24 **discussion** [8] 23/15 **defined** [1] 31/13 47/25 51/25 79/21 82/5

definition [3] 32/1 34/16 97/15 102/18 104/9 discussions [2] 51/20 **Delaware [4]** 46/10 50/18 60/12 delay [2] 23/10 43/11

dismiss [2] 86/22 100/25 dispositive [1] 53/2 disproportional [1] 61/23 **dispute** [2] 23/20 76/6

disputed [1] 19/15 disregard [1] 53/8 **depending [2]** 65/10 94/6 **distinction [3]** 41/19 72/20 73/15

DISTRICT [4] 1/1 1/1

91/11 91/13 93/20 93/22 94/4 95/25 99/17 100/7 **couple [6]** 38/12 84/11

entries [1] 36/16

entry [1] 18/8

extra [2] 37/24 63/24 extraordinary [2] 80/3 80/11 facial [3] 40/20 86/22 96/21 **facilitate** [1] 45/14 facing [1] 85/9 **fact [9]** 45/9 50/9 50/13 50/16 67/19 71/11 86/13 105/2 105/5 **factor [8]** 52/7 53/21 53/21 53/24 53/25 60/18 61/22 62/24 factors [9] 22/2 53/5 54/9 54/18 54/19 55/3 57/12 61/3 81/15 facts [1] 40/3 **factual [2]** 21/3 22/11 **factually** [1] 36/15 **FAEGRE [1]** 17/18 fail [1] 22/3 faith [4] 24/25 25/24 25/24 30/17 family [2] 38/2 100/20 far [10] 21/16 24/5 36/2 36/2 36/4 36/4 43/6 56/12 **focuses [1]** 84/13 62/19 91/6 fast [1] 39/19 **feasible [2]** 93/15 93/15 **February [7]** 29/20 29/2 33/6 33/16 35/4 41/10 51/10 **February 4 [3]** 33/16 35/4 41/10 **federal [11]** 1/21 19/25 20/7 20/25 46/6 46/13 50/20 61/18 85/17 87/20 108/7 fee [3] 52/22 54/5 81/3 feel [1] 104/7 fees [8] 80/20 81/2 81/8 81/14 81/22 81/22 82/22 83/9 few [2] 51/1 69/22 fiction [3] 21/1 50/9 50/12 figure [3] 85/14 93/14 95/25 file [17] 23/7 24/18 87/6 87/10 87/13 88/17 90/4 90/5 90/5 90/12 90/13 91/19 92/1 92/3 92/7 92/8 103/22 **filed [17]** 19/18 29/19 33/4 33/5 33/23 33/24 34/2 34/8 34/14 34/16 34/19 34/21 34/23 39/16 51/12 89/10 91/16 **filing [5]** 29/22 86/21 89/6 91/18 91/24 **filter [1]** 100/4 final [1] 96/8 finally [1] 51/9

FINANCIAL [2] 12/14

39/23 40/16 68/16 72/23 15/4 **find** [4] 24/21 52/15 56/24 71/13 finding [1] 53/7 fine [25] 25/17 27/6 29/5 32/21 32/25 34/19 35/5 35/9 37/21 41/16 56/6 58/2 58/4 58/7 75/10 76/20 77/2 77/17 77/18 82/11 92/15 95/16 95/20 95/22 96/1 fingerprints [1] 68/20 **firm** [**7**] 64/8 65/8 65/11 65/11 65/16 68/3 71/17 **firms** [12] 59/19 63/12 64/9 65/10 67/5 67/9 67/15 68/2 68/5 69/18 69/23 71/19 first [9] 15/4 32/5 34/8 56/5 70/20 74/13 78/2 88/19 89/14 **fishing** [1] 71/10 **flag** [1] 55/1 **FLEXNER [2]** 16/2 16/5 **Floor** [4] 16/3 16/6 16/9 17/3 Florida [1] 16/9 **focus [2]** 22/1 40/20 folks [1] 63/13 follow [6] 20/7 20/16 86/3 87/23 96/25 102/20 **followed** [1] 27/12 **follows [2]** 19/3 52/10 **footnote** [1] 28/4 **foregoing** [1] 108/9 forensic [1] 100/2 forget [2] 50/9 50/13 form [3] 19/14 21/23 26/22 formal [4] 27/6 92/14 92/16 92/16 **format** [3] 23/4 96/25 102/20 **forth [4]** 23/8 23/12 23/13 104/1 **FORTNOFF** [1] 12/14 forward [1] 35/12 **Foundation** [1] 89/12 four [2] 17/6 89/4 fourth [2] 53/21 59/24 frame [4] 30/6 84/19 93/1 93/2 framework [2] 42/9 42/19 **Francisco** [1] 16/6 **Franklin** [1] 16/9 free [1] 48/17 Freedom [1] 89/13 front [4] 33/10 59/1 75/8 88/2 Frontier [1] 89/12 **full [4]** 29/14 30/11 54/22 107/25 full-blown [3] 29/14 30/11 54/22 **FULTON [1]** 18/2

each [6] 36/5 36/17 37/1

E-MERGES.COM [1]

United States District Court

expressed [1] 86/21

extend [1] 104/12

EPSILON [2] 6/22 17/20 extent [6] 32/24 39/20

function [2] 101/4 101/5 fundamentally [1] 28/10 funding [1] 52/24 further [2] 18/8 94/25 fuss [1] 34/9

G

gain [1] 20/19

game [1] 30/19 gamesmanship [2] 21/24 25/23 Gateway [1] 17/6 gave [1] 99/13 general [1] 80/6 gets [6] 25/25 51/14 52/17 61/25 62/6 96/3 **getting [11]** 20/23 21/5 23/3 29/16 43/7 47/1 60/24 61/10 84/10 91/14 101/16

give [17] 20/18 21/12 21/13 22/22 22/24 22/24 23/13 26/10 26/18 32/25 37/21 44/4 56/6 61/4 66/9 68/12 95/21

given [5] 51/11 54/13 86/16 104/21 105/10 gives [1] 90/17 giving [3] 21/8 21/8 21/11

goes [18] 21/16 34/4 38/22 40/16 43/25 45/1 56/12 60/8 60/8 60/9 62/23 68/22 79/10 81/5 81/13 82/19 93/24 99/19 **GOHUNT [1]** 11/18

gone [**5**] 30/17 54/14 63/24 79/25 92/14 good [21] 19/5 19/6 19/7 19/8 19/9 19/22 19/23 20/12 20/14 24/24 25/24 25/24 30/17 45/12 54/11 55/12 102/1 102/2 104/16

104/17 107/21 got [11] 21/22 25/24 26/12 37/19 48/15 59/1 66/6 73/20 75/11 86/18 96/5

gotcha [1] 30/19 gotten [2] 42/17 99/1 **Governor's** [1] 59/25 grant [2] 90/7 90/8 grasping [1] 71/13 Grassi [11] 22/1 44/2 44/17 45/3 52/7 52/11 53/25 53/25 54/1 57/10 60/18

gray [1] 82/16 great [1] 94/17 **group [12]** 3/4 3/9 5/14 15/14 16/17 16/17 17/14 20/24 63/10 93/7 95/8 107/5

groups [2] 89/5 89/7 **guardian** [1] 62/6 guess [5] 19/15 25/20 26/8 59/5 102/11

H

H-U-T-C-H-I-N-S [1] 102/4 half [3] 21/14 50/21 85/6 **HAMILTON** [1] 16/14 **handful** [1] 64/11 handle [1] 32/17 happened [4] 33/24 33/25 51/3 71/1 happy [4] 35/12 84/3 84/5 100/5 hard [1] 39/19 harder [1] 84/20 **HARVEY [2]** 1/16 19/2 has [49] 19/15 27/15 33/15 33/15 33/21 33/25 34/3 37/17 43/15 43/17 46/18 47/4 47/4 47/23 48/15 53/25 55/15 55/21

56/14 59/9 59/16 60/21 63/15 66/21 69/14 71/17 72/23 74/9 77/12 79/11 79/24 83/4 83/15 84/8 85/14 86/14 89/10 90/14 91/7 91/12 91/13 93/24 94/24 100/14 100/14

100/15 102/13 102/14 103/8 haunt [1] 28/8

have [180] have any [1] 66/20 haven't [5] 37/8 39/4 45/22 70/8 84/2 having [1] 25/9

HB [72] 1/4 1/8 2/3 2/7 2/12 2/16 2/21 3/3 3/8 3/12 3/17 3/22 4/3 4/8 4/12 4/17 4/21 5/3 5/8 5/12 5/17 5/22 6/3 6/7 6/12 6/16 6/21 7/3 7/8 7/12 7/17 7/21 8/3 8/7 8/12 8/16 8/21 9/3 9/7 9/12 9/17 9/21 10/3 10/7 10/12 10/16 10/21 11/3 11/7 11/12 11/16 11/21 12/3 12/7 12/12 12/17 12/21 13/3 13/7 13/12 13/17 13/21 14/3 14/7 14/12 14/16 14/21 15/3 15/8 15/12 15/17 15/21 he [18] 25/22 25/22 25/25 104/23

26/16 26/17 38/21 38/21 38/22 42/1 56/8 58/6 62/3

70/22 72/23 72/23 72/24 73/6 91/22 he'll [1] 41/25 he's [7] 22/25 57/3 62/13

72/22 73/9 73/12 95/23 hear [7] 19/21 25/5 26/21 35/21 38/4 54/24 56/10 **heard [4]** 39/21 56/23 102/8 104/24

hearing [4] 23/17 23/18 85/15 102/11

hearings [2] 95/24 96/3

help [1] 42/12 helpful [1] 55/25 her [1] 48/6 here [53] 19/17 19/20 20/10 20/16 21/19 21/24 22/10 23/6 23/15 28/9 33/8 37/8 37/13 37/18 40/18 41/22 42/9 42/17 42/23 44/1 45/25 46/18 46/22 48/1 48/19 49/18 50/14 51/2 53/13 57/17 58/24 59/1 65/23 68/2

70/6 71/5 71/16 71/19 71/20 79/12 83/21 85/3 85/9 87/25 90/18 93/22 94/22 95/23 96/8 101/17 104/25 105/3 105/6 here's [1] 21/7 hesitate [1] 28/7 hey [1] 42/11 hiding [1] 71/5

highest [1] 70/24 highly [1] 61/23 **him** [**5**] 28/12 55/22 73/10 73/13 99/18

his [6] 38/25 45/18 48/5 56/24 71/17 81/20 hits [1] 61/19

HIYA [4] 2/4 16/22 27/4 52/3

HOGAN [2] 17/9 104/18 **holding** [1] 70/17 **HOLDINGS** [3] 13/18 17/15 17/16

holidays [1] 61/11 home [1] 36/20 honor [191] **Honor's** [5] 20/16 40/10

93/12 98/12 100/16 **HONORABLE [2]** 1/16 19/1

hope [3] 105/14 105/18 106/8

hopefully [1] 90/7

hoping [1] 87/21 hopper [1] 87/7 horse [1] 50/12 hour [1] 104/21 hours [4] 105/21 105/24

105/25 106/2 housekeeping [2] 86/18

HSIAO [1] 16/5 huge [2] 86/9 92/20

huh [1] 64/13 hundred [3] 72/23 72/24 84/11

hundred-page [1] 84/11 **HUTCHINS** [3] 18/2 102/3 102/4

I'd [3] 78/1 96/15 97/16 **I'll [10]** 19/21 55/22 62/21 76/5 76/7 80/12 90/20 90/23 94/3 104/21

held [3] 19/1 22/18 27/13 I'm [42] 25/3 25/5 25/17 28/15 28/15 29/15 33/20 34/19 35/12 46/17 47/3 47/8 48/3 48/24 49/25 51/14 52/1 52/10 55/19 57/17 66/15 67/2 68/9 69/19 70/18 75/10 78/21 78/22 79/2 79/25 80/17 82/10 86/3 88/1 89/19 91/6 103/4 103/15 104/6 104/6 105/15 106/17 I've [13] 38/18 59/1 77/13 77/14 85/6 85/7 86/18 99/17 99/18 100/6 100/7 104/4 107/13 i360 [1] 11/9 idea [3] 60/1 70/22 80/8 identification [3] 25/14 26/18 83/24 identified [5] 31/1 36/3

36/4 86/8 99/23 identify [6] 24/12 28/16 78/12 78/20 84/3 84/5 identity [1] 36/12 **III [4]** 1/16 16/15 17/13 19/2

Illinois [2] 16/21 17/14 illustrative [2] 55/4 55/5 immediately [1] 70/16 **important** [3] 20/21 70/16 105/4

importantly [1] 21/13 **improperly** [1] 105/6 **impropriety** [1] 43/17 **inaccurate** [2] 36/15 42/22

INC [49] 1/5 1/10 2/4

2/23 3/4 3/9 3/18 4/9 4/14 5/18 17/15 17/20 5/14 5/23 7/4 7/9 7/18 7/23 8/4 8/9 8/13 8/18 8/22 9/4 9/14 9/18 10/18 10/22 11/22 12/9 12/23 13/4 13/23 14/9 14/22 15/9 15/18 15/23 16/17 16/17 16/18 16/18 16/18 16/22 16/22 17/8 17/14 17/15 17/16 17/16 17/20

include [6] 24/11 41/2 63/19 83/14 98/19 99/12 included [4] 60/20 82/13 82/14 99/4

18/4

including [3] 59/20 76/8 78/12

Incorporated [1] 102/7 increased [1] 102/25 **independent** [1] 53/23 individual [29] 36/18 45/14 45/16 45/18 46/7 48/4 48/9 63/9 63/10 63/12 63/14 64/5 64/18 65/6 65/7 65/14 65/17 65/22 68/1 68/5 70/2 72/21 72/22 73/4 79/19 80/2 88/5 96/23 99/21 **individuals** [**8**] 37/10 51/11 79/19 98/17 98/19

99/4 99/12 100/15 **individuals'** [1] 84/24 inflect [1] 70/23 INFOMATICS [2] 2/13 17/4

INFORM [2] 2/9 17/4 **information** [22] 17/15 20/19 21/5 21/7 29/15 37/23 38/24 44/24 45/5 49/19 51/6 51/9 55/18 60/22 61/22 71/14 91/21 92/5 97/25 98/16 100/15 100/22

initial [1] 21/1 **INNOVIS** [1] 7/18 inquiry [2] 64/1 65/23 insert [1] 75/14 **INSIGHTS** [1] 4/14 insofar [2] 74/15 83/12 inspection [1] 25/3 **instances** [1] 36/5 instead [2] 21/15 76/15 **Intelius** [1] 17/16 INTERACTIVE [1] 14/9 interest [25] 22/7 22/13 41/5 42/24 43/3 43/24

44/7 44/23 45/2 45/5 51/15 53/19 53/23 54/1 57/7 60/3 60/25 61/14 78/3 83/5 86/21 90/25 91/2 91/7 91/8 interested [3] 30/3 89/6

103/23 interests [3] 43/22 74/22 75/12

Intermediate [1] 17/16 **INTERNATIONAL** [3] **interpreted** [1] 104/9 interrogatory [2] 71/8

71/9

invoking [1] 53/15 involved [1] 25/23 **involvement** [1] 78/25 involving [2] 91/24 91/25 **irrelevant** [1] 64/25 isn't [12] 22/12 24/22 45/7 45/25 48/12 66/13 68/19 81/23 82/5 88/4 92/8 92/23

issue [41] 19/13 21/11 26/21 29/11 30/6 30/22 32/23 35/14 42/2 42/17 42/23 47/9 47/10 48/1 53/13 53/14 56/4 63/20 64/14 66/11 66/13 71/16 76/14 80/25 83/24 84/17 85/5 85/15 86/17 93/2 96/14 97/17 99/1 99/18 100/1 101/3 101/9 101/17 103/22 103/23 104/8 issued [1] 51/10 issues [25] 19/19 22/9 30/5 35/18 35/23 37/16 39/11 52/9 54/23 60/9

64/24 85/9 85/12 87/11

88/21 89/20 90/18 91/12

issues... [7] 91/14 97/16 102/13 102/14 103/21 104/5 104/9

it's July 15th [1] 88/11 item [3] 31/17 53/21 73/19

items [4] 31/3 31/8 58/24 59/4

iterations [1] 29/9 its [2] 69/16 91/17 itself [3] 44/19 47/23 62/10

January [12] 29/20 29/20 31/24 32/6 32/14 32/20 34/10 34/23 35/4 41/10 51/8 93/25

January 1 [6] 32/14 32/20 34/10 34/23 35/4 41/10

January 2023 [1] 32/6 jerry [1] 23/2

jerry-rigged [1] 23/2 **JERSEY [23]** 1/1 1/13 16/12 16/16 17/7 17/19 17/24 41/7 45/8 45/13 55/14 59/6 60/13 60/14 68/13 89/9 89/10 91/16 91/18 91/24 91/24 91/25 92/8

John [16] 1/21 1/21 44/1 44/17 45/3 52/8 52/10 52/12 52/25 53/22 60/18 61/3 61/22 62/23 81/14 108/13

joinder [4] 50/16 53/10 53/18 60/3

joint [3] 68/14 68/18 95/7 JOSEPH [1] 16/8 **JOY** [1] 12/9

judge [34] 1/16 19/2 32/20 33/20 35/11 37/12 38/12 38/16 39/2 39/15 40/5 40/22 42/7 48/5 61/25 69/12 71/8 74/1 76/18 77/15 79/24 81/24 85/1 85/3 95/16 95/22 96/5 97/4 97/7 98/9 100/19 101/3 101/13 101/21

judicial [4] 18/7 38/2 91/5 100/19

July [14] 88/9 88/11 88/13 88/15 88/18 95/10 95/13 95/16 95/17 95/19 95/24 96/4 96/6 96/8

July 15th [1] 88/13 July 31st [4] 88/15 88/18 96/6 96/8

June [16] 1/14 31/2 86/25 87/1 87/13 87/14 87/16 88/3 88/4 89/18 90/1 90/10 94/18 95/3 95/9 108/13

June 10th [3] 87/1 89/18

90/1

June 14th as [1] 90/10 June 2nd [1] 31/2 jurisdiction [47] 20/9 20/20 30/12 33/21 34/15 37/17 37/21 39/7 39/11 40/9 40/14 40/15 42/8 42/16 42/20 43/14 43/18 44/22 46/10 46/13 46/22 51/21 53/19 54/8 54/21 55/8 55/10 55/15 56/25 57/18 57/25 59/17 60/7 60/9 64/1 74/16 78/15 81/6 81/7 82/15 82/20 82/21 82/24 83/13 92/21 97/16 100/6 just [81] 20/15 21/15

21/19 25/10 25/14 26/16 29/2 29/18 30/6 30/12 32/15 32/24 34/10 36/10 37/13 39/13 40/2 40/6 40/7 40/20 42/5 44/6 48/3 Largely [1] 89/14 50/2 50/19 51/17 52/1 52/6 52/10 53/4 54/21 54/24 55/3 55/4 55/22 55/23 56/13 57/17 57/22 59/7 61/4 62/19 65/4 66/9 66/15 69/6 69/20 71/7 73/9 73/24 75/3 75/7 77/1 77/4 77/25 79/20 80/10 86/13 86/18 89/19 90/10 91/2 93/21 95/6 95/22 96/4 96/8 97/17 102/7 102/10 102/17 102/22 104/6 104/22 105/4 105/9 105/16 106/4 106/15

106/16 107/16

keep [3] 50/1 50/1 51/16 keeps [1] 62/3 **KIMREY [4]** 16/20 27/3 52/2 86/12

kind [11] 28/8 40/12 50/25 54/10 79/25 84/7 84/12 85/8 93/7 93/9

106/13 kinds [4] 26/12 37/16

59/20 91/20 **KNIGHT** [6] 9/9 17/8 17/8 38/10 99/20 100/14 know [102] 20/8 20/23 21/17 22/20 23/21 25/10 25/22 25/23 27/16 29/6 29/16 29/19 29/22 30/3 30/6 30/13 30/20 35/13 36/6 36/10 36/12 39/18 39/21 40/7 41/12 41/18 41/20 41/23 41/24 42/3 42/12 42/13 44/6 45/9 46/18 47/21 47/22 49/23 52/20 55/13 55/16 55/21 56/3 56/6 56/18 57/4 59/4 81/8 81/9 81/14 81/22 59/9 59/16 59/18 60/1 60/2 62/11 63/10 63/13

64/21 64/21 65/3 66/23

66/24 67/1 67/15 67/18

68/19 72/21 78/19 80/1 80/5 80/6 80/24 81/8 81/19 84/10 84/11 84/16 84/17 84/22 85/10 85/16 86/7 87/17 87/21 87/24 88/20 89/20 90/17 91/15 91/22 92/10 92/11 92/17 92/17 92/18 93/5 93/23 94/10 95/22 96/13 98/25 101/20 105/15 107/11 known [1] 89/24 Kratovil [1] 89/10 Kurz [3] 1/21 1/21 108/13

L.L.C [1] 15/14

L.P [3] 4/18 17/15 17/15 LABELS [1] 7/9 laboring [1] 94/24 LABS [1] 7/4 **Larry [1]** 18/6 LaSalle [1] 16/21 last [20] 20/17 27/22 28/8 31/15 31/21 33/3 33/5 34/14 34/16 34/19 34/21 34/23 39/16 70/11 71/1 87/24 102/11 102/15 106/11 107/6 late [2] 29/20 33/6 later [4] 24/21 39/12 58/7 105/4 latest [1] 33/17 **LATHAM [1]** 17/12 law [47] 16/11 18/7 37/7 38/1 41/6 42/14 42/14 44/8 45/10 45/14 45/16 45/22 46/4 46/24 48/5 48/10 48/17 48/20 51/6 59/12 59/19 59/20 59/24 60/4 60/4 60/14 60/17 61/1 63/12 64/22 65/16 67/5 67/5 67/9 67/15 68/5 69/18 69/20 69/23 74/23 76/23 78/18 91/1 91/16 91/25 100/20 101/7 lawsuit [1] 23/2 lawsuits [4] 51/12 79/5 79/21 80/9 lawyers [8] 28/9 70/23 71/9 84/11 84/20 91/17 105/15 106/9 lay [1] 83/4 **least** [4] 31/22 72/9 90/2 107/1

Legislature [9] 45/20 48/4 48/16 49/10 59/6 59/19 59/22 60/13 91/6 Legislature's [1] 91/1 **legitimate** [2] 34/4 53/23 let [10] 25/20 26/21 43/2 47/1 48/17 55/6 55/22 75/7 94/7 107/11 let's [20] 31/5 32/15 34/9 39/10 40/20 40/24 48/18 48/18 49/1 49/11 49/11 57/21 65/3 73/22 84/16 86/3 94/9 96/7 96/8 107/10 letter [26] 22/4 22/5 22/25 23/12 24/15 27/22 27/23 28/1 28/4 28/21 31/2 31/10 31/11 41/3 44/19 61/2 64/17 66/21 68/18 68/21 69/17 74/9 74/13 74/21 76/2 92/11 **letters** [9] 40/8 63/5 64/15 64/17 66/16 67/5 67/10 67/10 70/5 **LEWIN [1]** 17/18 **LEXISNEXIS** [1] 13/13 **LIFETIME [3]** 14/18 17/11 104/19 **light [2]** 86/13 87/10 **LIGHTBOX** [3] 4/18 17/15 17/15 like [32] 20/4 23/18 25/2 25/7 29/17 35/13 45/13 50/2 59/9 68/19 69/1 70/24 76/21 76/21 78/1 78/7 79/20 80/25 84/12 84/15 85/14 86/7 87/5 87/6 87/8 87/9 90/2 95/7 96/15 96/22 97/17 107/7 likelihood [1] 54/6 **limit [4]** 47/23 57/20

limited [9] 39/16 46/16 57/17 67/14 76/9 81/7 82/21 85/13 105/21 **limiting** [1] 30/12 limits [3] 102/9 102/25 103/19 line [1] 54/17 lines [2] 30/21 89/14 list [28] 21/8 23/21 26/4

102/19 104/13

limitation [1] 106/7

26/4 27/15 36/17 36/25 37/6 38/14 39/1 52/10 56/5 58/17 58/20 58/21 58/22 77/5 86/8 86/9 92/13 97/19 98/19 99/8 99/19 99/21 99/21 100/8 100/14

listed [2] 18/8 74/14 listen [1] 49/1 **listing** [1] 58/16 lists [8] 7/9 35/18 36/15 39/4 98/10 98/22 99/4 99/10

litigating [1] 89/9 **litigation [8]** 26/11 52/24

54/4 78/13 80/20 84/20 84/23 85/6 **litigations** [4] 41/4 67/6 78/3 78/13 little [7] 21/22 32/23 37/16 47/24 54/10 75/4 87/22 live [1] 90/2 LLC [38] 2/9 2/13 2/18 3/23 4/4 4/23 5/4 5/9 6/4 6/9 6/18 6/22 7/14 9/9 10/4 10/9 11/9 11/13 11/18 12/4 12/14 13/9 13/14 13/18 14/4 14/18 16/17 16/17 16/18 16/18 17/4 17/4 17/4 17/8 17/16

16/14 17/2 17/5 17/9 17/12 17/18 17/22 18/2 **lobbied** [1] 59/19 located [1] 55/14 **location** [1] 106/25 **log [28]** 24/13 25/19 27/14 29/2 29/14 29/24 30/5 30/11 83/24 84/10 84/11 84/16 84/17 85/8 85/12 85/18 86/1 86/15 86/17 91/14 91/21 92/4 92/10 92/12 92/24 93/14 93/19 94/2 logs [1] 32/24

long [18] 35/8 44/1 44/17

52/25 53/22 58/12 60/18

45/3 52/7 52/10 52/12

17/16 17/20 17/20

LLP [11] 16/2 16/5 16/11

61/2 61/22 62/23 74/17 81/14 82/10 96/4 look [12] 22/23 33/18 36/7 44/2 44/8 46/17 48/23 62/11 69/18 71/15 90/6 100/7 looked [2] 33/10 45/22 looking [1] 22/10 lost [1] 44/1 **lot** [**3**] 29/21 63/20 84/20 **LOVELLS [2]** 17/9

104/18 LTD [1] 12/18 **LUSHA** [1] 8/13

M

ma'am [1] 101/25 MacStravic [1] 18/6 made [10] 23/18 26/2 36/19 38/20 40/17 51/5 70/6 70/11 73/16 84/7 **Madison [1]** 17/10 main [3] 86/25 90/19 103/16 **maintain** [1] 40/15 maintenance [1] 47/22 make [15] 23/22 25/3 28/22 35/3 39/21 48/18

makes [2] 56/6 74/20

107/16

56/22 63/17 72/7 91/3

95/13 96/17 97/22 106/15

leave [8] 76/25 87/8

90/8 90/14

82/22 83/9

Lee [1] 95/23

leeway [1] 96/5

87/10 88/17 90/5 90/7

legal [9] 45/9 80/19 81/2

legislation [1] 59/21

legislator [1] 59/12

legislators [1] 60/13

M

Maldonado [2] 72/21 73/4 management [4] 6/22 13/13 17/20 70/12 manner [1] 51/16 many [7] 23/11 70/22 70/22 88/25 89/3 105/2 106/24

MAO [1] 16/5 Maria [1] 18/7 MARK [1] 16/5 match [1] 90/3 materials [1] 28/22 matter [42] 20/9 23/14 30/12 33/21 34/15 37/17 37/21 39/7 39/9 39/10 40/13 42/8 42/16 42/19 43/14 43/17 46/22 51/20 54/21 55/7 55/9 55/15 56/25 57/14 57/18 57/25 59/17 60/6 60/9 64/1 74/15 78/15 81/5 81/7 82/15 82/20 82/21 82/24 83/13 92/21 97/16 108/10

MAX [1] 6/4 may [29] 19/5 23/19 33/8 36/15 36/19 39/13 43/16 43/16 45/9 51/24 52/13 53/5 55/2 55/19 56/11 58/10 60/3 63/11 65/21 66/21 72/13 72/21 73/6 74/6 90/6 91/16 93/17 94/6 101/16

matter-jurisdiction [1]

34/15

maybe [11] 27/8 63/11 66/24 73/24 74/9 87/21 95/18 105/19 106/23 107/1 107/5

McCARTER [1] 17/5 McGEE [3] 16/8 71/21

McGee's [2] 65/11 65/15 me [29] 23/12 23/14 23/20 24/4 25/20 26/21 28/8 33/10 38/21 42/3 43/2 47/1 55/1 55/6 55/20 56/11 58/20 59/2 60/22 66/9 66/22 68/11 68/12 75/7 75/8 88/2 94/4 103/14 107/11

mean [32] 21/1 24/4 24/24 26/8 26/11 45/24 46/17 47/12 47/23 48/2 48/15 48/18 50/8 55/11 57/19 58/17 59/11 67/2 74/20 74/25 75/11 78/17 80/9 81/19 85/22 88/16 89/16 89/20 90/7 91/18 94/20 97/25

means [1] 85/16 meant [1] 106/2 measures [1] 86/18 mechanical [1] 1/23 meet [6] 28/4 93/14 94/4 99/18 101/8 106/6

MELISSA [2] 10/13 16/15

member [2] 38/2 100/21 members [3] 32/8 68/25 79/16

membership [1] 33/15 mention [1] 56/8 mentioned [4] 37/2 38/13 39/15 55/22

mentioning [2] 57/25 98/24

MERGES.COM [1] 12/23

merits [8] 38/22 46/23 54/22 90/11 99/19 100/2 100/23 101/17

mid [2] 29/20 62/14 mid-2023 [1] 62/14 mid-January [1] 29/20 middle [1] 93/10 **might** [**6**] 30/20 56/17 62/6 81/4 89/2 94/15 million [1] 46/20 mindful [1] 97/15 mine [3] 63/1 78/5 79/3 minimum [1] 63/5 minute [4] 18/8 50/11 65/5 75/5

Mitchell [1] 1/12 modification [2] 75/16 75/19

moment [2] 35/20 102/8 Monday [1] 1/14 monetary [1] 62/7 **monetize** [1] 49/17 **Montgomery** [1] 16/6 month [1] 93/19 months [5] 30/21 98/20 99/5 99/13 100/23 moot [2] 34/10 58/10

more [10] 23/7 27/9 36/2 36/4 85/13 87/22 102/11 102/22 104/10 104/23 MORGAN [6] 16/8 16/8

71/21 71/22 85/1 85/2 morning [14] 19/5 19/6 19/7 19/8 19/9 19/22 19/23 20/12 20/14 39/12 102/1 102/2 104/16 104/17

morning's [1] 19/11

most [5] 21/13 29/19 41/21 51/8 55/23 motion [11] 23/7 46/11 46/11 57/2 57/2 57/4 57/4 86/22 87/8 90/5 90/13 **motions** [6] 19/12 19/18 87/10 87/22 88/17 89/17

motive [4] 21/14 53/1 53/2 60/8 motives [1] 52/7 move [5] 40/24 57/21 86/17 100/25 103/18 moved [4] 102/14 102/14

103/4 103/8 moving [1] 77/4 **Mr [6]** 36/13 38/4 50/7

59/15 85/14 107/13 Mr. [51] 19/15 19/21 20/11 21/21 25/20 27/11 28/10 28/21 28/21 30/18 30/25 31/2 32/16 32/18 34/18 35/14 35/21 35/22 36/14 36/19 38/13 38/18 41/19 42/24 55/21 56/8 58/6 62/22 65/11 65/15 66/10 67/4 70/21 71/17 71/22 72/20 72/21 73/4 73/19 74/8 75/9 75/24 76/3 79/25 92/6 93/24 94/12 94/23 95/3 95/23 106/23

Mr. Christie [3] 35/14 35/22 58/6

Mr. Lee [1] 95/23 Mr. Maldonado [2] 72/21 73/4

Mr. McGee's [2] 65/11 65/15

Mr. Parikh [5] 32/18 38/18 71/17 71/22 94/12 Mr. Parikh's [3] 28/21 31/2 42/24

Mr. Shaw [7] 20/11 25/20 32/16 55/21 56/8 75/9 75/24

Mr. Stio [26] 19/15 19/21 21/21 27/11 28/10 28/21 30/18 30/25 34/18 35/21 36/14 38/13 41/19 62/22 66/10 70/21 72/20 73/19 74/8 76/3 79/25 92/6 93/24 94/23 95/3 106/23 Mr. Stio's [2] 36/19 67/4 **much [3]** 96/9 107/9

108/1 Mulberry [1] 17/7 multiple [3] 29/8 71/4 95/24

must [1] 89/24 my [25] 19/24 20/6 27/25 33/9 36/5 43/10 43/22 43/22 44/18 56/13 58/22 65/11 84/6 84/12 92/9 97/24 99/15 101/3 102/3 102/13 103/18 104/1 104/4 105/1 105/5

MYHERITAGE [1] 12/18

myself [1] 95/23

name [3] 37/22 38/8 102/3 Named [3] 72/9 72/17 73/12 names [14] 36/3 36/4 36/6 36/6 36/16 38/16 49/19 69/19 69/20 69/21 97/20 99/1 99/3 100/14 narrow [9] 22/1 22/6 32/4 40/13 50/1 61/17 61/20 86/8 86/16

narrower [1] 75/10 **narrowing** [1] 42/19 narrowly [1] 53/10 **nature [2]** 83/15 104/23 necessarily [4] 26/6 55/2 56/22 66/24 necessary [3] 37/20 47/9 75/16 **need** [19] 20/19 21/6

22/17 22/20 27/16 28/20 41/1 42/2 43/10 66/7 70/16 77/25 83/16 84/23 95/3 97/5 97/11 103/22 107/21

Network [1] 98/6 never [4] 85/7 85/21 91/7 100/24 new [30] 1/1 1/13 16/3

16/12 16/16 17/3 17/3 17/7 17/11 17/11 17/19 17/24 32/6 41/7 45/7 45/12 55/14 59/6 60/13 60/13 68/13 89/9 89/10 91/16 91/18 91/24 91/24 91/25 92/7 94/15 Newark [2] 17/7 17/24

next [23] 1/19 2/25 3/25 4/25 5/25 6/25 7/25 8/25 9/25 10/25 11/25 12/25 13/25 14/25 16/24 17/25 53/21 73/19 78/24 80/18 83/18 89/17 107/24 night [1] 27/22 **nightmare** [1] 105/15

nine [1] 70/5

nid.uscourts.gov [1] 1/21 no [42] 22/23 24/17 25/5 29/11 31/1 31/7 31/17 32/20 40/18 43/19 47/20 48/15 48/23 50/11 56/2 56/20 57/6 57/23 64/3 65/16 65/18 65/18 69/25 70/1 70/2 74/17 75/16 76/17 77/9 79/19 80/15

80/25 83/9 84/2 84/17 89/19 89/21 95/1 98/2 102/22 106/6 107/14 Nobody [1] 105/17 Nobody's [1] 71/4

noncompliance [4] 49/23 61/13 62/15 84/21 nondisclosure [4] 22/16 32/5 49/20 70/17

none [3] 37/16 45/11 57/8 nonprofits [1] 89/22 normal [1] 30/8 North [3] 16/21 17/13 18/3

not [130] noted [1] 28/4 **nothing** [5] 33/25 43/17 48/18 55/15 107/23 notice [2] 21/25 40/8 notices [4] 30/3 43/11 55/17 104/25 notion [1] 81/8 now [36] 22/22 23/1

23/11 26/12 28/20 31/5 38/24 40/24 42/3 43/9 45/9 47/5 53/2 58/15 60/2 63/24 64/11 65/17 65/20 66/13 67/25 68/7 70/13 71/13 73/22 74/7 79/1 89/19 89/25 94/9 95/23 96/20 97/24 99/8 100/16 100/23

number [126] number 1 [1] 34/24 **numbered** [1] 76/3 **NUWBER [1]** 13/23

0

oar [1] 94/24 object [2] 31/9 80/6 **objecting [1]** 80/16 **objection** [7] 31/1 31/4 31/7 31/8 62/21 78/6 102/21 objectionable [1] 80/22 **objections** [1] 19/18 **objects** [1] 23/9 obligation [1] 24/11 obligations [4] 81/9 83/6 83/7 83/9 obtain [1] 44/25 **obtained** [4] 76/8 76/9 76/10 76/10 obtaining [1] 74/24 **obvious** [1] 91/23 **obviously [15]** 26/11 29/21 37/12 42/5 45/22 67/9 69/14 82/23 89/20 92/7 94/17 94/21 106/20 107/11 107/14 occasions [1] 22/16 occurred [2] 22/10 51/9 occurring [1] 22/21 occurs [1] 33/16 off [3] 21/22 23/3 86/17 offense [1] 70/21 offered [2] 71/4 99/18 Office [1] 59/25

officers [9] 22/15 42/13 50/17 51/2 54/25 67/6 70/10 70/25 78/18 Official [2] 1/21 108/7 oh [7] 31/19 41/23 54/24 63/1 79/2 87/17 94/21 okay [36] 23/5 30/23 30/24 33/7 35/10 37/5 41/7 49/21 50/6 56/6 65/25 67/7 68/7 70/3 71/1 73/25 74/19 75/18 75/21 77/16 77/18 78/6 84/9 85/2 86/2 86/5 90/22 95/9

96/7 96/17 98/21 99/6

101/13 102/24 104/3

officer [15] 36/19 38/2

43/9 45/15 45/17 45/23

48/21 52/17 81/20 100/20

48/4 48/5 48/10 48/18

100/20

once [1] 84/19

107/9

narrowed [1] 92/22

0

one [**59**] 22/2 23/6 28/3 28/9 29/2 30/6 30/20 33/17 33/20 35/11 35/23 36/21 39/20 40/6 40/8 42/4 43/6 46/4 52/7 52/12 52/14 53/4 54/17 54/18 57/10 57/22 59/4 62/2 62/12 63/11 65/21 69/3 70/12 72/7 72/14 76/14 77/4 77/24 78/2 78/24 79/19 80/13 81/1 82/4 83/18 85/8 85/11 86/20 88/21 91/12 91/14 93/18 100/9 103/22 103/23 104/6 104/22 104/22 106/15

ones [5] 51/2 59/2 77/20 77/21 77/23

only [11] 32/2 50/14 51/4 52/7 55/9 61/7 64/11 70/12 101/13 102/14 103/21

open [2] 19/1 77/11 **opportunity** [**3**] 102/12 102/22 105/10

opposed [3] 51/4 93/7 106/21

opposes [1] 28/9 opposing [1] 92/24 **opposition** [9] 28/5 46/11 52/5 53/9 54/15 54/24 88/8 88/9 96/10

oppositions [1] 96/11 opt [1] 27/23

ORACLE [4] 5/18 17/15 17/15 17/16

Orange [1] 16/12 order [27] 19/17 20/5 23/15 23/23 24/11 24/20 26/22 27/7 27/8 28/16 37/6 74/18 74/19 83/12 83/21 86/6 88/14 90/21 92/15 93/12 96/24 97/8 97/9 98/13 100/16 107/22 107/24

ordered [3] 35/25 85/19 92/13

orders [1] 85/21 other [45] 20/8 23/18 23/20 24/19 36/25 39/11 42/14 45/3 45/11 45/16 50/21 51/5 51/24 55/8 56/23 57/10 57/18 59/18 59/20 63/14 67/2 67/11 68/4 69/21 70/1 71/19 72/14 72/22 73/4 81/3 85/5 86/18 90/4 91/5 95/24 96/3 96/23 97/16 99/20 101/17 103/17 104/2 104/7 105/2 107/1 others [3] 37/15 44/18 107/17

otherwise [1] 94/8 ought [2] 26/22 74/9 our [43] 21/8 22/5 22/8 22/8 26/4 26/4 27/19

30/17 33/8 34/16 37/2 39/15 39/18 39/25 40/8 42/12 48/18 49/11 50/2 56/5 58/13 60/7 61/4 63/8 party [19] 20/6 22/7 63/12 64/9 67/4 68/4 71/6 22/12 41/5 43/3 43/24 75/1 75/3 75/3 75/22 75/23 76/6 77/5 83/9 85/15 88/23 92/21 99/2 101/18 103/19

our perception [1] 39/25 ourselves [1] 106/6 out [30] 24/2 24/21 32/5 32/7 35/18 36/3 49/20 52/10 52/16 57/17 63/16 66/21 67/5 76/7 76/25 79/18 79/20 83/4 85/14 93/5 93/6 93/14 95/25 96/24 97/16 105/11 105/18 106/9 106/24 106/25

outside [4] 14/9 62/4 81/5 103/1

over [9] 20/3 20/4 25/19 32/1 60/16 68/20 79/19 85/9 94/14

overall [2] 71/3 87/23 **overburden** [1] 20/15 overlap [1] 54/10 own [1] 102/17

P.C [1] 16/20 page [8] 16/24 17/25 31/11 84/11 102/19 102/25 103/19 104/12 pages [15] 1/19 2/25 3/25 4/25 5/25 6/25 7/25 8/25 9/25 10/25 11/25 12/25 13/25 14/25 102/16 parameters [2] 30/2 56/15 PARENT [2] 4/18 17/15 PARIKH [11] 16/11 29/1 32/18 36/13 38/18 50/7 59/15 71/17 71/22 85/14

94/12

Parikh's [3] 28/21 31/2 42/24

PARKER [1] 18/2 parol [3] 44/16 61/25 62/11 parse [2] 93/6 97/16

parsing [1] 93/5 part [9] 42/16 45/23 45/24 48/9 55/16 57/10 61/6 90/15 103/16 **participate** [**5**] 105/10 105/10 105/12 106/5

107/3 participated [1] 28/3 participating [1] 107/17 participation [2] 78/2 107/15

particular [5] 30/6 36/17 82/17 91/19 101/1 particularly [1] 24/5 parties [9] 21/10 24/25

42/24 44/13 44/14 60/3 62/2 87/11 96/15 parties' [1] 102/9 44/7 44/22 45/2 45/5 51/15 53/19 57/7 60/25 62/9 69/8 83/5 86/20 92/24

Filed 06/13/24

passed [1] 59/23 past [1] 85/6 Pat [1] 22/25 path [2] 25/9 82/11 pathway [1] 41/21 pay [1] 81/22 payment [2] 80/19 81/14 **PBA** [22] 21/12 21/12 22/21 22/22 32/8 41/4 43/6 44/25 46/8 47/15 47/21 50/25 51/20 51/21

55/9 55/13 67/11 68/19 68/21 68/24 69/3 79/16 **PBA's** [1] 68/20 **Pearl** [1] 16/3 **PEM** [1] 16/11

people [15] 2/18 7/4 17/4 22/17 37/2 39/1 43/8 60/24 63/10 66/22 68/23 80/2 87/7 97/21 98/15

PEOPLECONNECT [3] 8/22 17/16 17/16 **PEPPER** [1] 16/14 percentage [2] 34/3

52/17 **perception** [**3**] 39/18 39/25 99/3

perhaps [2] 29/15 90/9 peril [1] 39/2 period [18] 23/25 26/1

29/25 31/14 31/14 32/12 32/13 34/13 35/1 35/3 35/7 35/9 39/19 41/9 41/13 62/15 84/13 93/23 permissible [1] 82/20

permission [1] 105/12 **permit** [4] 23/19 45/13 78/22 80/17

permits [1] 45/8 **person** [8] 36/21 37/22 38/1 43/21 47/16 76/22 100/4 100/19

personal [3] 40/9 40/14 100/5

personnel [1] 91/25 **persons** [16] 36/8 38/14 38/20 38/25 39/4 39/5 91/5 97/19 98/3 98/10 98/19 99/9 99/19 99/22 105/1 105/7

perspective [3] 55/21 60/7 101/3 **petition [2]** 89/10 90/12

phone [2] 36/20 36/20 phrased [1] 54/11 pitch [1] 23/23 **place [11]** 20/7 22/17 33/1 37/14 46/4 62/14

62/15 62/16 62/17 85/17 106/12 placed [1] 106/7

plaintiff [13] 23/8 23/15 23/22 26/23 28/17 65/14 65/17 65/22 72/21 72/22 73/4 73/12 98/24 **plaintiffs** [**101**] 1/4 1/8

2/3 2/7 2/12 2/16 2/21 3/3 3/8 3/12 3/17 3/22 4/3 4/8 prerequisite [1] 53/7 4/12 4/17 4/21 5/3 5/8 5/12 5/17 5/22 6/3 6/7 6/12 6/16 6/21 7/3 7/8 7/12 7/17 7/21 8/3 8/7 8/12 8/16 8/21 9/3 9/7 9/12 9/17 9/21 10/3 10/7 10/12 10/16 10/21 11/3

11/7 11/12 11/16 11/21 12/3 12/7 12/12 12/17 12/21 13/3 13/7 13/12 13/17 13/21 14/3 14/7 14/12 14/16 14/21 15/3 15/8 15/12 15/17 15/21

16/4 16/7 16/10 16/13 20/13 22/2 23/24 29/2 30/1 44/4 46/25 49/8 58/11 60/12 61/9 63/9

63/11 63/12 63/14 64/5 64/19 65/6 65/7 68/1 68/6 70/2 72/10 72/17 85/2 plaintiffs' [7] 27/14 74/8

74/13 85/7 86/13 97/17 106/25 **planning** [1] 39/20

plate [1] 101/18 **platform** [3] 42/12 78/19 98/7

Plaza [1] 17/23 **please [2]** 38/8 104/22 **plus [2]** 29/22 37/13 POE [1] 18/2 point [20] 19/20 26/18 29/20 34/10 39/19 40/2 40/6 50/5 51/25 54/20 58/10 79/23 83/1 90/25 91/17 92/5 101/19 103/20

points [3] 33/20 46/3 104/22

105/4 105/23

police [12] 22/15 36/18 42/13 43/9 47/15 48/4 50/17 54/25 67/11 69/1 69/3 81/20

policies [2] 33/13 44/5 policy [1] 45/12 portion [1] 48/10 **position** [8] 23/21 27/19 38/25 39/15 56/22 105/1 105/2 105/5

positions [1] 28/10 possible [1] 45/14 possibly [4] 89/4 89/12 89/12 89/13

potential [**5**] 79/5 80/9 87/22 102/18 106/19 practiced [1] 70/21 **PRECISELY [2]** 13/18

17/24 predates [1] 84/16 preexisting [1] 53/23 prefer [1] 96/4 preference [1] 20/6 **prejudice** [1] 54/7 **prepare** [1] 90/19 **prepared** [3] 23/13 24/7 80/2

presence [1] 53/22 present [4] 18/5 32/14 32/22 34/11 Press [1] 89/13 pressing [1] 39/12

presume [1] 35/15 pretty [6] 19/19 24/4 40/17 45/17 80/3 80/3 prevails [1] 45/23 prevent [1] 21/24 **previously** [1] 83/25

PRICE [1] 16/20 **Princeton** [2] 16/16 17/19

prior [**5**] 22/16 30/3 37/2 74/23 98/13 privacy [83] 1/3 1/7 2/2

2/6 2/11 2/15 2/20 3/2 3/7 3/11 3/16 3/21 4/2 4/7 4/11 4/16 4/20 5/2 5/7 5/11 5/16 5/21 6/2 6/6 6/11 6/15 6/20 7/2 7/7 7/11 7/16 7/20 8/2 8/6 8/11 8/15 8/20 9/2 9/6 9/11 9/16 9/20 10/2 10/6 10/11 10/15 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/11 11/15 11/20

12/20 13/2 13/6 13/11 13/16 13/20 14/2 14/6 14/11 14/15 14/20 15/2 15/7 15/11 15/16 15/20 23/1 33/12 42/14 45/19

12/2 12/6 12/11 12/16

49/14 49/16 49/17 59/21 91/1 91/7 91/12 privacy-related [1] 59/21

private [1] 49/17 privilege [44] 20/3 20/4 24/13 24/14 25/9 25/12 25/18 25/19 25/19 26/2

27/13 27/17 29/2 29/12 29/14 29/24 30/5 30/11 32/24 83/24 84/4 84/10 84/15 84/17 85/8 85/12 85/18 85/20 86/1 86/15

86/16 86/17 91/14 91/21 92/4 92/9 92/12 92/24 93/12 93/13 93/14 93/19 94/1 94/2

privileged [8] 25/14 25/16 26/5 26/12 26/17 27/16 85/22 85/23 probably [1] 56/18 probe [1] 47/9

problem [9] 32/20 64/14 65/21 74/17 77/9 83/9 98/9 107/11 107/13

procedure [3] 45/21 85/17 105/11 proceedings [4] 1/23 19/1 108/6 108/10 process [8] 19/24 20/7 21/16 30/15 51/23 60/2 79/21 91/18

produce [19] 23/16 23/22 23/24 24/17 24/20 25/6 25/7 26/23 29/14 31/22 35/25 38/21 60/5 60/12 71/4 85/7 85/19 85/22 92/13

produced [14] 1/23 27/12 28/17 28/23 35/24 74/14 74/18 80/7 82/7 83/12 85/24 92/17 94/10 95/2 **producing [4]** 61/21 64/15 85/12 94/11

product [1] 55/18 **production [9]** 23/8 30/9 31/1 31/9 54/15 70/4 77/24 93/23 94/23 **PRODUCTS** [1] 6/9

progeny [1] 44/2 properly [1] 50/23 PROPERTYRADAR [1] 15/9

proportional [6] 46/18 47/4 51/17 55/20 60/11 93/21

proportionality [3] 30/1 30/7 54/20

propose [7] 74/22 75/3 93/9 94/11 95/5 95/6 106/3

proposed [6] 22/23 30/16 35/17 54/15 56/5 90/14 **proposing** [1] 88/14 prosecutor [3] 38/2 48/5 100/20

protect [1] 45/18 **protected** [1] 23/17 provide [11] 32/21 35/17 37/25 52/21 56/5 76/23 84/9 84/17 92/16 94/2 97/18

provided [6] 27/14 37/6 71/22 97/19 98/10 99/20 **provides** [1] 20/5 **providing** [1] 29/8 proving [1] 20/22 **provision** [5] 33/11 59/7

59/10 59/12 68/13 **provisions** [1] 60/14 **public** [1] 45/12 pull [1] 76/5 **purported** [1] 66/11 purportedly [1] 76/8

purpose [7] 20/23 44/22 48/2 48/20 48/24 49/2 49/4

purports [1] 76/23

purposes [3] 53/9 53/19 54/8

pursuant [1] 98/12

pursue [2] 46/9 62/6 put [12] 19/17 21/4 22/5 22/11 30/2 34/16 37/14 37/22 61/8 91/21 92/15 104/1 **putting [3]** 30/4 50/12

0

93/19

quality [1] 70/24 QUANTARIUM [1] 4/4 **QUARRY** [1] 4/23 quarters [1] 31/17 query [1] 52/6 question [15] 19/15 24/9 25/25 42/7 45/10 56/1 57/22 61/7 63/6 63/23 64/22 66/5 67/4 69/13 79/15

questioning [1] 105/20 **questions** [16] 21/14 41/22 50/3 51/17 51/18 51/22 55/24 65/1 74/15 77/10 77/25 78/1 80/6 81/3 83/8 83/13 quick [1] 38/12 quickly [2] 39/13 77/5 quite [2] 47/5 105/15

raise [6] 26/18 35/14 35/19 102/7 102/10 104/5 raised [5] 19/14 21/11 40/7 56/4 82/18 Raj [1] 29/1 **RAJIV** [1] 16/11 rather [1] 19/17 **Raymond [1]** 17/23 **RDR** [1] 108/13 RDR-RMR-CRR-CRC **[1]** 108/13 **RE** [1] 6/4 **RE/MAX [1]** 6/4 reach [1] 51/25 read [3] 75/25 76/7 79/12 relationship [4] 21/10 ready [1] 29/22 real [17] 2/22 22/7 22/12 | relevance [4] 33/2 33/8 41/5 42/23 43/3 43/24 44/7 44/22 45/1 45/5 51/15 53/19 57/7 60/3 60/25 83/5 realized [1] 71/11 really [11] 23/4 30/22 32/9 37/20 47/9 64/25 66/3 77/4 78/21 84/12 106/6 **Realty** [1] 17/14 reason [6] 36/17 36/24 76/1 79/9 92/15 105/22 reasonable [1] 21/5 reasons [5] 32/23 39/19 49/14 49/16 54/12 **REATH [1]** 17/18 receive [1] 24/3

received [5] 36/6 38/13

38/15 98/23 101/4

receiving [1] 37/15

Filed 06/13/24 recently [2] 33/7 104/4 Recess [1] 74/4 recognize [2] 22/3 38/17 **recognized** [1] 56/17 record [10] 23/17 23/18 23/18 38/8 73/18 82/11 91/3 105/5 106/5 108/10 recorded [1] 1/23 records [3] 25/4 93/11 93/13 recover [1] 48/17 red [3] 5/23 16/18 55/1 redact [3] 38/19 49/19 100/22 100/16

recovery [10] 34/3 45/14 45/24 45/24 48/10 48/11 48/14 48/21 52/13 52/18 redacted [3] 37/24 97/25

redaction [1] 97/18

reduce [1] 38/19 reference [2] 57/18 58/17 referenced [1] 59/9 **referring** [1] 62/3 **reflecting** [1] 66/10 **regard [2]** 59/10 98/25

regarding [1] 84/7 registration [1] 53/8 regularly [1] 100/4 relate [3] 41/2 55/7 93/18 **related [26]** 30/22 42/8 44/3 46/12 47/14 47/18

47/25 51/15 59/5 59/21 60/6 60/12 60/24 61/22 62/24 63/3 66/14 67/6 79/21 80/6 81/3 82/7 82/24 86/21 89/15 93/6 relates [18] 42/16 51/16 60/2 64/1 64/22 64/23

64/25 65/16 65/19 67/2 78/15 78/21 80/23 82/2 82/22 83/8 84/18 84/21 relating [3] 56/12 56/24

97/9 41/4 62/2 62/9

51/14 60/10 relevant [25] 22/2 25/15

31/14 31/14 32/13 34/14 35/1 35/3 35/7 42/15 43/1 46/11 47/4 54/18 60/6 61/3 61/24 63/25 66/4 66/5 67/12 74/15 83/13 85/23 93/23

relief [1] 87/23 rely [1] 59/8 remand [16] 19/12 20/24 37/13 40/21 46/12 50/22 57/15 93/6 100/17 101/19 102/9 102/13 104/10 106/16 106/19 106/20 remember [5] 20/21

50/21 51/1 55/16 64/12 remind [1] 102/17 **REMINE [2]** 8/9 16/18 **remotely [1]** 107/3

removal [2] 57/15 104/4 remove [4] 36/20 50/15 51/9 71/12 removing [1] 51/6 replacement [1] 77/5 reply [1] 97/2 **Reporter [2]** 1/21 108/14 **REUTERS [1]** 9/23

108/14 **Reporters** [1] 89/13 represent [10] 46/7 63/13 65/16 68/5 68/5 71/6 72/4 86/14 102/6 106/18 representation [5] 68/14

68/18 70/6 70/11 71/6 representations [2] 22/20 104/24

represented [9] 31/22 32/10 37/10 64/7 65/8 65/10 70/15 85/14 86/14 **representing** [17] 63/14 67/18 67/25 68/1 68/16 69/23 69/24 70/7 71/18 71/19 71/24 72/9 72/17 73/2 73/3 73/10 73/13 represents [1] 68/8

reproach [1] 70/25 request [20] 20/9 23/8 24/7 24/18 26/25 30/9 32/5 36/19 37/19 38/22 75/1 75/2 75/5 75/11 75/23 92/9 92/16 93/17 93/17 99/22 requested [5] 20/1 35/15

37/24 66/4 100/16 requests [35] 19/16 21/24 22/8 22/17 27/6 36/21 37/11 38/20 39/3 39/22 40/11 42/17 49/20 50/9 51/3 54/14 54/23 56/24 58/15 70/17 73/21 77/12

77/14 84/7 84/18 92/14 92/16 92/22 98/20 99/9 99/24 100/24 104/25 105/3 105/6 **require** [5] 23/24 60/11

63/20 93/18 94/4

required [2] 23/16 39/5 requirement [1] 84/22 requiring [1] 26/23 **RESEARCH** [1] 6/13 residency [1] 50/19 resolved [1] 84/2 respect [25] 19/12 24/1 27/12 36/14 40/6 55/22 58/15 61/9 64/18 64/18 71/1 77/5 81/2 93/7 94/2

94/3 94/22 96/20 101/1 102/9 102/23 104/2 104/10 104/10 105/8 respectfully [1] 20/9 responds [1] 24/19 response [6] 58/13 74/14 74/18 83/12 93/11 95/1 responsibilities [4] 81/22

83/6 83/7 83/16

responsibility [3] 80/19 81/1 81/8 responsive [2] 56/19 84/4 rest [1] 19/19 **RESTORATION [1]** 11/4 **REPORTER'S** [1] 108/7 | review [1] 95/4 Reporter/Transcriber [1] reviewed [3] 59/25 97/20 98/22 revisit [3] 42/1 83/24

10

rid [1] 99/1 rigged [1] 23/2 right [133] rights [13] 42/13 43/3 43/22 44/12 44/14 45/18 49/9 49/17 61/15 62/6 74/23 81/20 84/24 rise [5] 19/4 74/3 74/5 99/13 108/5

97/17

RISK [1] 13/13 **Riverfront** [1] 17/23 **RMR** [1] 108/13 road [3] 17/19 30/21 93/10

ROBERT [2] 17/2 17/13 **ROCKETREACH [2]** 14/4 16/18 **ROCKWELL** [1] 12/9

room [1] 59/18 **ROSS [1]** 17/18 route [1] 26/24 **RPC** [1] 68/13 rule [18] 19/18 21/25 24/1 24/7 24/18 26/24 27/11 28/18 30/9 44/16 62/1 71/12 85/17 85/18 85/23 87/21 94/25 104/2

Rule 34 [1] 85/18 ruled [4] 77/12 77/13 77/14 83/25 rules [6] 19/25 20/7 47/5

85/17 86/4 105/24 **RYAN [3]** 16/8 71/21 85/1

safety [4] 6/9 91/2 91/6 91/8 said [26] 21/3 22/22 24/16 25/22 25/23 32/21 32/21 32/23 34/12 34/13 37/20 40/12 45/4 48/24 56/5 56/13 58/6 59/11 67/12 72/10 72/16 76/12 99/17 100/6 100/7 100/7 same [8] 27/7 35/2 35/3 41/9 71/22 72/3 96/25 102/20 San [1] 16/6 **SANDERS** [1] 16/14 **SARAH [2]** 18/2 102/3 satisfy [1] 55/3 SAUL [1] 17/22 say [45] 24/17 24/20 26/20 29/7 33/11 33/13

say... [39] 34/10 37/25 41/25 43/10 44/2 44/2 46/8 50/12 50/24 51/18 52/17 54/24 55/21 58/11 61/3 62/8 77/1 79/12 80/13 80/15 81/19 81/21 84/16 86/13 90/1 90/7 93/12 93/21 94/5 94/6 94/23 95/12 95/15 95/18 96/6 96/21 97/6 102/8 106/21 saying [16] 22/16 23/1 29/11 42/18 43/21 47/1 47/17 50/2 54/20 55/1 55/13 56/2 57/3 59/10 59/13 94/18 says [17] 26/17 41/6 41/23 44/8 46/24 56/18 60/17 61/1 62/1 66/8 68/14 71/9 85/25 91/15 98/15 99/21 99/21 **SCALABLE** [1] 6/18 **schedule [6]** 19/12 28/19 87/3 87/11 87/23 87/24 scheduling [2] 94/9 96/5 scheme [5] 45/25 48/3 48/12 48/13 49/18 **SCHILLER [4]** 16/2 16/5 68/3 72/3 scope [6] 19/11 22/6 22/7 28/14 39/14 39/16 **SCOTT [2]** 17/6 38/9 search [3] 4/23 21/18 30/13 **SEARCHBUG [1]** 15/18 searched [1] 30/14 SEARCHERS [2] 2/18 17/4 seated [2] 19/5 74/6 second [1] 36/20 secured [1] 87/7 see [16] 20/4 25/18 31/19 34/5 36/22 47/8 50/3 60/10 60/11 67/8 87/5 87/8 90/19 94/5 96/8 107/10 seeking [1] 82/19 seem [1] 60/6 seems [9] 23/14 23/20 24/4 32/4 42/3 60/22 78/7 80/10 91/23 seen [1] 87/15 selected [1] 50/18 send [5] 43/11 67/9 98/4 99/4 99/13 sends [1] 97/24 sense [5] 48/19 49/11 56/7 74/20 95/14 sent [19] 27/22 32/5 36/3 37/3 39/5 49/20 61/11 61/12 66/21 67/5 67/10 79/18 79/20 97/22 98/19 99/24 104/25 105/3 105/6 separate [9] 54/2 63/3 64/23 66/11 66/13 66/24 68/24 97/9 103/16

| Docament 10 | |
|---|-------------------|
| September [1] 97/6 | 75. |
| September 30th [1] 97/6 | sim |
| serve [3] 21/24 21/25 | sim |
| 26/24 served [1] 30/4 | sin 37. |
| service [25] 29/8 29/9 | sin |
| 31/23 32/22 32/25 32/25 | 47 |
| 33/3 33/8 33/10 33/15 | sir |
| 33/15 34/7 57/13 71/2 71/3 79/11 79/14 79/17 | 95. sit |
| 80/21 80/23 80/24 82/3 | sitt |
| 82/5 83/3 93/25 | situ |
| services [3] 47/18 76/23 | 53. |
| 77/1 | six |
| set [12] 23/12 23/13 24/5 26/5 26/9 26/9 28/17 | size slic |
| 36/17 40/13 44/14 87/9 | sma |
| 90/10 | so |
| sets [1] 44/12 | so- |
| setting [1] 106/12 | sol |
| seven [9] 30/21 58/23 74/9 87/21 90/2 96/22 | soli soli |
| 105/24 105/25 106/2 | SO |
| seven-day [2] 87/21 | sol |
| 96/22 | son |
| several [4] 87/7 87/7 99/5 99/13 | 29. 35. |
| SEYFARTH [1] 17/2 | 42 |
| sham [5] 44/7 52/6 54/25 | 48 |
| 55/2 55/3 | 60. |
| share [2] 52/13 95/7 | 75. |
| sharing [1] 34/3 SHAW [10] 16/2 17/2 | 91. 10 |
| 20/11 20/12 25/20 32/16 | 10 |
| 55/21 56/8 75/9 75/24 | son |
| sheet [1] 18/8 | son |
| short [3] 34/6 73/24 89/22 | 57. |
| short-circuit [1] 34/6 | son |
| should [28] 19/16 23/23 | 30 |
| 25/18 26/16 26/23 27/12 | 56 |
| 39/16 39/18 43/5 52/9 52/21 53/8 53/18 57/3 | 93. |
| 60/19 61/15 63/17 67/13 | 10 Sor |
| 80/22 84/9 85/24 86/15 | son |
| 88/1 92/18 94/21 95/18 | soo |
| 97/3 105/21 | SOO |
| shouldn't [4] 62/10 89/16 96/23 101/14 | sor sor |
| show [4] 46/12 55/2 57/1 | 10 |
| 57/6 | sou |
| shows [1] 43/6 | sou |
| side [4] 24/19 70/23 | sou |
| 80/10 85/7 sign [6] 18/8 23/1 32/8 | Sou spa |
| 47/15 71/8 79/12 | 99 |
| sign-in [1] 18/8 | spe |
| signed [1] 59/25 | spe |
| significant [3] 29/15 29/25 30/15 | 66. spe |
| significantly [1] 92/22 | 57. |
| signing [1] 43/7 | spe |
| Silver's [13] 44/1 44/17 | spe |
| 45/3 52/8 52/11 52/12 52/25 53/22 60/18 61/3 | spl |
| 61/23 62/23 81/15 | SP6 |
| similar [3] 33/12 75/2 | 36. |
| | 1 |

| | _ |
|--|--------------|
| 75/22 | st |
| imple [1] 29/18 | st |
| imply [2] 51/17 65/1 | st |
| ince [6] 22/18 33/3 34/7 | st |
| 37/3 70/17 106/23 | sta |
| ingle [5] 35/15 37/1 47/16 65/11 68/4 | 7 |
| ir [6] 27/2 84/25 91/10 | sta |
| 95/21 97/13 104/15 | 6 |
| it [1] 90/18 | st |
| itting [1] 94/22 | 8 |
| ituation [6] 20/16 49/22 | st |
| 53/10 61/8 61/12 98/24 | 5 |
| ix [2] 58/14 85/6 | 9 |
| ize [1] 54/1 | st |
| lice [1] 20/17 | sta |
| mall [2] 107/5 107/7 o [132] | sta ST |
| o-called [1] 99/8 | 1 |
| ole [1] 44/21 | \mathbf{S} |
| olicitation [1] 68/22 | sta |
| oliciting [2] 22/14 32/8 | 4 |
| SOLUTIONS [1] 7/18 | 5 |
| olves [1] 72/6 | st |
| ome [36] 19/13 22/19 | sta |
| 29/13 29/20 30/2 35/11 | st |
| 35/13 37/7 37/12 37/14 42/14 43/16 44/10 47/6 | sto |
| 48/21 53/23 56/15 57/20 | ste |
| 60/1 66/9 68/2 75/12 | sti |
| 75/25 85/10 85/11 90/21 | 7 |
| 91/17 93/8 95/3 96/5 | \mathbf{S} |
| 104/1 104/24 105/11 | 1 |
| 105/19 106/13 107/4 | 2 |
| omebody [1] 30/21 | 3. |
| omehow [4] 20/23 50/17 57/1 91/21 | 7 |
| omeone [2] 33/14 47/21 | 7 |
| omething [14] 27/21 | 9 |
| 30/20 33/16 55/21 56/8 | St |
| 56/18 81/21 85/14 87/23 | sti |
| 93/24 95/25 101/4 106/9 | st |
| 106/21 | st |
| Sometime [1] 88/9 | st |
| omewhat [1] 104/13 oon [1] 87/12 | st |
| ooner [1] 94/17 | st |
| orry [2] 79/2 88/1 | St |
| ort [3] 54/5 90/21 | 1 |
| 105/11 | St |
| ought [1] 50/22 | st |
| ound [1] 54/11 | st |
| ources [1] 21/18 South [2] 16/3 18/3 | st |
| pam [4] 37/16 98/25 | 2: |
| 99/1 100/4 | 3 |
| peak [2] 57/12 58/7 | 3 |
| pecific [6] 50/19 57/17 | 4 |
| 66/9 84/10 93/6 96/24 | 4 |
| pecifically [4] 50/18 | 5 |
| 57/25 68/12 92/21 peculation [1] 21/4 | 5. |
| peculation [1] 21/4 pend [1] 93/18 | 6 |
| plitting [1] 48/14 | 8 |
| SPOKEO [1] 10/22 | 8 |
| preadsheets [3] 35/24 | 9. |
| 36/2 36/6 | su |

affs [1] 89/23 age [1] 100/12 and [1] 37/8 anding [1] 35/14 art [9] 21/17 22/17 8/21 29/3 29/16 31/2 4/8 85/15 100/2 arted [4] 22/14 26/11 1/10 92/11 **arting** [**3**] 29/19 51/3 4/21 ate [8] 20/24 38/8 45/10 0/15 60/22 61/17 71/12 1/24 ated [1] 71/17 atement [1] 72/7 atements [1] 70/19 **FATES [3]** 1/1 1/16 9/2 **FATUS** [1] 1/5 atute [11] 45/8 45/12 6/4 46/6 48/14 49/2 49/4 6/25 79/24 91/15 91/25 atutory [2] 45/25 48/3 ayed [1] 101/20 aying [1] 85/11 eam [1] 107/25 enography [1] 1/23 **ep [3**] 37/25 63/24 79/7 **ill [4]** 36/16 37/8 45/4 9/25 **FIO [29]** 16/15 19/15 9/21 21/21 27/11 28/10 8/21 30/18 30/25 34/18 5/21 36/14 38/13 41/19 2/22 66/10 70/21 72/20 3/19 74/8 76/3 79/12 9/25 92/6 93/24 94/23 5/3 106/23 107/13 tio's [2] 36/19 67/4 ipulate [1] 101/1 op [1] 57/4 opped [1] 37/14 ory [1] 24/22 raightened [1] 24/2 raightforward [1] 24/5 raws [1] 71/13 treet [6] 16/3 16/6 16/9 6/21 17/7 18/3 reets [1] 1/13 rong [2] 54/6 70/20 ructure [1] 81/3 uff [2] 26/17 43/10 bject [49] 20/8 21/23 3/3 23/25 27/1 30/12 3/21 34/15 37/17 37/21 9/7 39/8 39/10 40/13 2/8 42/16 42/19 43/14 3/17 46/15 46/22 51/20 2/9 54/21 55/7 55/9 5/15 56/25 57/14 57/18 7/25 58/6 59/17 60/6 0/9 63/25 74/15 78/15 1/5 81/7 82/15 82/20 2/21 82/24 83/13 92/21 4/7 97/16 106/19 **bmit** [1] 102/17

submitted [1] 22/4 subset [1] 20/23 **substantive** [1] 104/22 **substitute** [1] 76/17 subsumed [2] 78/7 80/21 sue [1] 45/17 sufficient [1] 97/4 **suggest** [2] 32/11 90/9 suggested [3] 27/22 63/22 90/25 **suggesting** [1] 62/13 suing [2] 46/19 46/21 **Suite** [**5**] 16/12 16/16 17/13 17/19 18/3 **Sunshine** [1] 89/15 Sunshine-related [1] 89/15 superseding [1] 33/14 **supplement** [1] 103/15 supplemental [2] 88/6 103/23 **support** [1] 28/12 **supported** [1] 28/1 **suppose** [1] 106/6 suppression [4] 97/22 98/20 99/5 99/9 Supreme [1] 89/11 sure [15] 24/10 29/16 33/20 51/14 52/19 55/19 67/2 69/19 78/21 86/19 97/22 103/15 104/6 106/17 107/16 surprise [1] 89/21 **surprising** [1] 56/24 surrounding [1] 45/1 **suspect** [1] 67/10 **sustain [2]** 62/21 80/12 **SYNAPTIX** [1] 12/4 system [6] 37/3 69/18 98/16 100/1 101/5 105/19 systems [6] 4/9 8/13 8/18 99/25 100/3 101/6 SZYBA [1] 17/2

table [1] 70/24 tail [1] 46/17 take [15] 20/6 25/9 28/20 39/1 39/3 43/11 49/18 70/20 73/24 79/7 82/8 100/8 100/21 104/25 107/4 take-down [3] 39/3 43/11 104/25

taken [2] 43/10 74/4 taking [2] 22/17 28/10 talk [12] 22/5 23/4 31/5 36/23 50/24 51/13 61/14 65/3 77/8 84/7 94/9 96/7 talked [10] 29/7 40/9 55/7 58/18 58/24 79/24 83/5 93/24 106/11 107/6 talking [15] 26/1 29/8 29/14 30/13 30/18 42/9 45/25 46/22 62/1 69/1 71/2 80/1 81/11 93/1 93/3 talks [2] 48/14 85/23

Case 1:24-cv-04324-HB

Tampa [1] 16/9 targeted [2] 22/8 22/9 **TECHNOLOGIES [3]** 9/9 17/8 38/10 TECHNOLOGY [1] 12/4 **teed** [1] 19/20 tell [4] 43/2 44/9 47/1 68/11 tells [1] 38/21 **TELNYX** [1] 11/13 **TELTECH [1]** 8/18 templates [1] 35/17 ten [1] 51/7 tens [1] 93/19 term [4] 31/13 33/8 33/15 51/15 terms [34] 21/18 29/8 29/9 29/25 30/7 30/13 31/23 32/22 32/25 32/25 33/3 33/10 33/12 34/7 56/15 56/16 64/24 64/25 71/2 71/3 71/6 78/21 79/11 79/14 79/17 80/21 80/23 80/24 82/3 82/5 83/3 83/4 93/25 97/2 test [3] 61/7 66/7 70/18 testifies [1] 42/1 testify [2] 41/25 76/22 thank [30] 19/10 27/20 30/24 38/6 40/4 40/22 50/6 74/1 74/2 74/11 76/18 77/15 90/24 91/9 96/19 97/1 97/7 97/10 97/14 101/12 101/22 101/23 104/14 107/9 107/19 107/20 107/25 108/2 108/3 108/4 them [51] 20/18 21/2 21/5 21/11 21/12 21/13 22/19 24/20 25/17 26/10 26/18 29/6 29/11 32/25 35/25 37/7 37/10 37/14 37/15 38/14 38/21 39/12 40/1 41/22 42/19 44/25 50/18 51/8 52/10 55/23 57/4 65/16 66/3 68/8 70/4 70/17 71/4 71/7 72/24 77/10 78/21 85/11 85/19 85/22 87/13 90/17 90/19 92/13 93/12 95/7 101/9 themselves [5] 52/21 62/8 98/3 101/14 105/7 theory [1] 55/11 thereafter [1] 87/3 therefore [1] 51/12 these [71] 20/23 21/14 22/15 22/16 22/18 22/18 26/12 26/13 29/19 37/7 37/10 39/4 40/11 41/24 43/21 43/22 45/13 45/21

47/15 50/8 50/14 50/15

51/11 51/18 54/25 55/3

55/4 55/24 57/12 57/12

58/4 60/24 61/10 62/3

50/19 51/2 51/4 51/5

62/13 66/25 67/6 67/16 67/20 67/21 68/23 69/18 70/16 71/9 71/11 71/12 76/12 78/18 79/10 80/7 84/24 87/11 88/20 89/5 93/6 93/8 93/11 94/14 97/22 98/10 98/15 98/18 99/4 99/9 100/9 100/24 106/24 they'd [1] 84/15 **They'll [1]** 90/10 they're [41] 20/3 20/4 22/9 22/23 22/24 23/13 24/13 25/11 25/13 25/19 30/3 38/1 39/12 43/24 46/19 46/21 50/22 51/19 55/5 57/3 64/7 65/9 65/18 65/22 67/18 68/1 69/21 70/10 71/13 72/11 72/12 82/19 85/18 87/12 87/13 89/22 92/7 100/17 100/17 100/18 100/25 they've [9] 32/9 32/9 33/22 61/2 63/24 82/18 97/19 98/9 100/15 thin [1] 20/17 thing [9] 29/2 36/25 42/4 45/18 56/23 80/13 82/23 101/13 106/15 things [17] 21/19 22/3 22/17 23/9 24/16 26/12 29/16 38/12 51/1 56/5 59/20 78/1 80/25 81/4 84/11 91/20 94/7 think [99] 19/19 20/5 20/15 20/21 21/16 21/22 22/11 23/3 25/15 25/15 25/18 26/8 26/13 26/16 27/8 28/9 28/12 28/15 28/20 29/5 29/12 30/5 30/15 30/16 32/8 32/13 32/22 34/3 36/11 37/20 40/17 41/15 41/15 41/16 41/18 41/20 41/25 41/25 42/7 46/11 47/23 48/13 55/11 56/3 56/8 56/10 56/12 56/13 56/17 59/23 60/19 61/17 61/18 61/21 61/25 63/18 63/25 64/16 65/15 70/18 73/20 77/17 80/20 80/21 81/5 81/11 82/12 82/18 83/3 83/11 83/16 83/25 84/6 84/8 84/9 84/19 85/5 85/13 86/9 88/3 88/4 88/11 91/11 92/20 93/2 93/21 94/13 94/16 95/22 96/11 97/3 101/8 101/18 103/7 103/8 105/1 105/18 105/20 106/11 thinking [1] 89/19 thinks [1] 38/22 third [2] 59/24 86/20 third-party [1] 86/20 this [92] 19/10 19/20 20/16 20/17 20/19 21/16 22/15 23/2 23/11 23/17

25/24 26/21 28/7 30/15 30/22 32/1 32/10 33/1 34/4 35/11 35/14 35/19 38/18 39/6 39/12 41/3 41/13 42/12 44/24 45/7 47/9 47/10 49/18 50/16 52/5 53/9 54/20 55/6 55/13 55/16 56/4 57/14 59/18 59/22 59/23 60/4 61/25 62/4 62/8 62/23 63/6 63/23 67/2 68/19 68/20 68/22 70/7 70/15 70/21 70/22 70/23 71/10 79/1 79/14 79/14 79/16 79/20 80/10 80/16 81/6 82/16 82/17 82/19 84/13 85/10 85/13 86/8 89/24 92/20 93/21 93/23 94/10 94/11 99/17 99/18 99/19 99/21 100/8 101/19 104/8 105/22 106/16 **THOMSON** [1] 9/23 though [3] 20/25 76/7 thought [4] 75/10 75/11 76/6 83/23 thousands [5] 38/16 38/16 93/19 97/20 99/3 three [15] 31/17 31/22 36/21 53/1 63/12 65/10 67/4 67/9 68/4 70/13 89/4 93/25 94/14 94/16 95/6 three-quarters [1] 31/17 through [22] 19/16 23/21 29/3 29/21 30/2 30/5 30/17 31/3 35/4 41/10 51/8 51/23 54/14 58/19 58/20 62/11 73/20 79/25 85/10 91/18 98/5 101/5 throwing [1] 57/17 time [38] 23/1 23/25 26/1 26/13 28/8 28/18 29/25 30/2 30/15 31/14 32/4 32/7 32/11 32/13 33/12 33/24 34/13 35/7 35/9 37/3 41/13 51/7 51/25 54/24 62/15 63/20 71/1 84/13 84/19 91/17 93/1 93/2 93/23 95/3 96/9 102/15 106/12 107/6 times [1] 70/22 timetable [2] 94/11 95/5 timing [2] 21/9 54/4 today [16] 19/17 23/15 23/21 37/8 40/3 41/16 83/21 86/8 90/18 90/23 97/12 97/15 101/10 104/24 107/22 107/25 together [2] 93/19 105/20 tomorrow [2] 90/23 107/25 too [6] 20/17 21/16 56/12

topic [**15**] 19/10 74/13 75/3 75/3 75/5 75/22 75/23 75/25 76/3 76/6 76/17 81/6 81/13 82/7 82/17 topic 1 [1] 76/3 topics [13] 22/8 24/1 73/23 74/7 74/9 75/7 76/12 77/19 80/7 82/5 93/8 94/22 94/25 total [1] 70/5 totality [8] 22/5 43/25 44/3 46/25 47/11 49/23 79/10 99/2 totally [1] 54/22 toward [1] 95/24 traditional [1] 23/7 **Transcriber** [1] 108/14 transcript [2] 1/23 108/9 transcription [1] 1/23 **transmitted [4]** 37/11 51/2 99/22 100/24 **TRANSUNION** [1] 10/9 **tried** [1] 20/16 **TROUTMAN [4]** 16/14 27/23 28/1 54/15 true [2] 24/17 68/2 trust [4] 52/8 52/11 54/9 61/9 **try** [**7**] 19/16 21/23 61/20 71/13 101/8 104/21 107/7 trying [14] 20/18 21/4 39/3 41/19 45/6 46/12 47/3 47/8 48/3 49/25 53/9 56/15 72/20 99/8 **Tryon** [1] 18/3 turn [2] 73/22 74/7 **TWILIO [1]** 3/18 two [18] 22/15 23/6 33/20 39/19 39/23 44/18 46/3 46/6 52/25 54/9 62/3 62/13 68/14 88/22 94/15 103/21 104/22 105/8 type [7] 44/24 48/14 55/18 60/1 69/18 69/20 71/16 types [1] 40/11

U.S [1] 1/12 **U.S.C** [3] 53/11 53/14 57/2 **Uh [1]** 64/13 **Uh-huh** [1] 64/13 **ultimately [4]** 28/16 84/12 90/1 90/6 **undefined** [1] 20/24 under [16] 19/25 24/18 42/13 42/14 45/10 52/25 53/10 53/22 57/7 60/18 64/22 71/12 81/14 82/6 84/4 105/24 **underlying [2]** 75/12 91/1 **understand [19]** 24/8 40/5 40/19 46/5 46/21

50/4 54/19 54/20 56/2 60/25 65/25 78/14 86/6 103/20 understanding [4] 27/25 63/8 80/1 97/24 **understood** [**5**] 60/15 77/15 101/21 102/11 102/15 unduly [1] 101/14 unequivocally [1] 40/10 unfortunately [2] 84/23 101/15 unilateral [1] 79/18 **union** [**3**] 69/1 69/2 69/7 unions [4] 41/7 47/15 56/4 69/3 **unique [9]** 36/25 102/12 102/13 103/2 103/3 103/5 104/1 104/7 104/10 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/16 19/2 universe [1] 85/13 unless [2] 24/21 103/23 unlike [1] 23/11 unlimited [2] 41/11 41/14 unnecessary [1] 21/19 **untethered** [1] 56/25 until [5] 26/24 34/14 41/16 61/11 74/4 **unusual** [2] 46/2 61/19 unwillingness [1] 97/18 **up [25]** 19/20 23/1 24/5 26/5 26/9 26/9 30/19 32/8 32/22 34/11 36/18 40/13 41/16 43/7 47/1 47/15 47/20 50/16 61/19 69/19 70/13 76/5 100/9 103/19 106/12 **upon** [5] 39/4 59/8 71/10 93/15 99/2 us [15] 17/9 21/15 22/24 22/24 38/23 46/9 46/19 61/6 61/9 61/20 72/18 84/9 93/18 95/16 100/2 use [8] 20/10 33/12 34/13 48/18 49/11 75/3 78/18 100/8 used [3] 31/13 44/21 57/19

103/19

35/8 71/4

47/3 47/11 48/3 49/2 50/4 versus [6] 41/20 71/2

vagueness [1] 20/5 **VALASSIS** [2] 14/13 17/24 **VALUE [3]** 14/18 17/11 104/19 various [1] 19/16 vary [1] 63/9 **VEDDER [1]** 16/20 veracity [3] 61/7 66/7 70/18 versions [4] 31/23 31/23

using [3] 51/16 57/3

vacations [1] 96/15

62/19 85/9 96/9

62/16 62/16

tool [1] 100/9

top [1] 54/10

took [4] 62/14 62/15

13

Case 1:24-cv-04324-HB

versus... [4] 81/2 81/9 83/6 93/23 very [7] 22/1 35/14 53/10 56/24 89/22 107/9 108/1 view [3] 19/24 90/11 98/18 **VIOLET [2]** 5/23 16/18 virtual [1] 106/13 virtue [4] 38/15 38/22 39/3 99/9 **volume** [1] 93/16 vs [72] 1/4 1/9 2/3 2/8 2/12 2/17 2/21 3/3 3/8 3/13 3/17 3/22 4/3 4/8 4/13 4/17 4/22 5/3 5/8 5/13 5/17 5/22 6/3 6/8 6/12 6/17 6/21 7/3 7/8 7/13 7/17 7/22 8/3 8/8 8/12 8/17 8/21 9/3 9/8 9/13 9/17 9/22 10/3 10/8 10/12 10/17 10/21 11/3 11/8 11/12 11/17 11/21 12/3 12/8 12/13 12/17 12/22 13/3 13/8 13/12 13/17 13/22 14/3 14/8 14/12 14/17 14/21 15/3 15/8 15/13 15/17 15/22

W

Wabash [1] 17/13 wagging [1] 46/17 wait [4] 19/18 50/11 65/5 75/5 waiting [1] 26/24 waiver [4] 40/9 40/14 40/18 100/5 walk [1] 58/20 walked [1] 32/9 want [55] 21/2 21/7 21/15 21/23 21/24 21/25 23/4 23/12 24/6 25/10 25/14 25/22 30/6 30/19 31/6 32/24 33/17 34/13 36/10 37/15 37/19 38/4 44/4 44/20 46/8 46/15 46/17 47/22 49/23 49/25 56/19 56/21 58/16 58/20 wholesome [1] 21/16 59/4 62/22 67/8 68/11 whose [2] 59/18 59/19 71/7 77/11 85/9 85/10 why [16] 22/11 22/12 87/17 87/18 90/7 92/4 22/25 30/25 34/9 36/17 92/12 94/23 96/1 97/22 43/20 49/10 49/10 49/13 100/1 100/10 105/9 56/15 63/19 65/24 80/15 106/15 107/14 89/16 106/21 wanted [11] 23/19 35/19 WILAND [1] 13/4 56/8 61/12 91/2 92/16 will [22] 23/15 26/2 27/7 102/7 102/10 105/4 106/4 28/16 30/15 38/21 45/23 107/16 45/24 60/11 65/14 74/7 wants [5] 26/20 58/7 83/3 83/20 95/21 95/23 59/22 88/20 105/17 96/2 96/11 97/9 105/9 wasn't [3] 48/21 49/18 105/11 107/12 107/24 56/4 WILLIAM [1] 17/22 **WATKINS** [1] 17/12 willing [3] 23/22 24/16 way [14] 21/5 23/7 24/5 26/10 26/9 27/15 29/18 36/18

39/24 50/14 55/23 79/14

79/19 81/6 82/18

ways [1] 23/6 we'd [4] 87/13 90/2 102/20 106/24 we'll [39] 23/25 24/2 24/4 27/17 29/12 83/25 84/4 28/17 30/23 34/10 35/21 37/21 37/22 37/25 39/11 40/1 56/6 57/20 61/20 71/8 73/24 74/8 74/20 75/13 75/14 76/16 76/16 76/25 78/8 90/2 94/5 95/12 95/25 96/21 96/24 96/25 97/6 97/8 101/1 104/12 107/2 107/7 107/25 we've [22] 29/6 29/11 30/16 30/16 32/21 36/5 42/17 50/22 54/14 54/17 71/4 79/24 80/7 86/8 93/13 93/22 96/5 97/20 98/22 99/1 99/23 104/24 website [3] 33/17 79/15 79/16 week [1] 94/5 weeks [5] 89/17 89/18 94/14 94/16 95/6 welcome [1] 38/7 went [3] 37/15 37/24 41/12 weren't [2] 61/11 61/12 West [1] 16/12 whatever [6] 59/11 60/3 77/13 81/25 90/19 107/5 whether [33] 19/16 20/1 20/2 26/22 34/4 38/1 52/12 53/22 54/2 54/3 54/4 54/6 54/11 54/12 60/2 64/1 64/22 65/23 66/10 66/13 66/23 66/24 75/11 77/10 88/20 91/22 93/14 100/3 100/9 100/19 100/21 101/3 106/12 WHITEPAGES [4] 1/10 16/22 27/3 52/2 who's [3] 44/22 47/21 107/4 whole [6] 48/2 49/18 55/17 79/23 82/23 83/1 wholesale [1] 85/12

window [2] 89/1 96/22

wish [2] 105/9 105/12

wished [1] 102/16 wishes [1] 106/5 withheld [10] 20/2 24/12 86/8 92/18 93/13 93/22 withhold [3] 25/11 25/13 93/10 withholding [6] 24/13 25/8 85/19 92/12 92/19 94/1 within [12] 23/24 29/24 42/19 51/7 53/25 56/14 81/4 82/14 93/11 94/5 94/14 94/15 without [1] 42/18 witness [23] 21/13 21/15 21/20 26/17 41/22 41/23 50/2 51/18 51/22 55/24 61/5 63/7 63/23 64/3 65/2 66/5 66/8 76/13 79/22 80/1 80/16 83/10 106/10 won't [2] 87/15 94/7 **wondering** [1] 52/1 word [1] 76/21 words [6] 45/16 55/8 57/19 57/19 90/4 103/17 work [12] 30/5 84/21 95/25 96/2 96/24 105/11 105/18 105/20 106/9 106/24 106/25 107/3 working [1] 107/13 works [2] 79/14 79/21 wouldn't [7] 56/20 60/20 81/16 81/16 82/8 92/3 103/22 writing [3] 22/25 25/8 58/13 YARDI [1] 4/9

yeah [49] 20/14 28/25 29/4 31/10 31/12 31/20 33/2 41/15 41/23 42/7 43/23 49/7 49/12 55/25 57/16 58/12 58/21 58/21 58/22 60/20 66/2 67/24 69/5 74/12 74/19 76/6 78/16 79/8 80/4 81/11 82/1 82/8 83/11 85/4 88/9 88/11 88/13 89/8 95/15 95/17 96/13 98/14 102/19 106/11 106/14 106/20 106/22 107/6 107/8 Year's [1] 32/6 years [1] 85/6 yes [32] 27/2 32/19 38/5 38/9 38/11 40/25 52/4 52/22 52/23 58/25 66/9 68/4 68/10 72/8 72/13 73/2 75/6 84/25 87/2 87/19 91/10 95/11 95/21 97/13 98/7 99/15 101/25 102/5 104/15 104/20 106/1 107/18 yet [2] 87/7 87/15 York [5] 16/3 17/3 17/3 17/11 17/11

you [207] you'd [4] 35/12 48/16 87/5 87/8 you'll [4] 24/2 37/22 37/23 40/8 you've [1] 23/11

zero [1] 89/2 **ZILLOW [1]** 9/14 **Zoom** [2] 106/13 107/1